CUK-H02851-4-P014420

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

4

BOARD OF EDITORS

GEORGE B. ADAMS
ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN
ALBERT BUSHNELL HART
JOHN BACH McMASTER
HARRY PRATT JUDSON
WILLIAM M. SLOANE
H. MORSE STEPHENS

MANAGING EDITOR
J. FRANKLIN JAMESON

VOL. IV

OCTOBER 1898 TO JULY 1899

903 C01|2A

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.
1899

P19926

COPYRIGHT, 1899
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY,
LANCASTER, PA.

CONTENTS OF VOL. IV

NUMBER 1. OCTOBER, 1898.

ARTICLES

ALBERT B. HART	The Historical Opportunity in America	1
SIDNEY B. FAY	The Execution of the Duc d'Enghien, II.	21
HENRY HARRISSE	The Outcome of the Cabot Quater-Centenary	38
GEORGE L. RIVES	Spain and the United States in 1795	62
LEVERETT W. SPRING	The Career of a Kansas Politician	80

DOCUMENTS—Thomas Shepard to Hugh Peter, 1645; The Illinois Indians to Captain Abner Prior, 1794; South Carolina in the Presidential Election of 1800; Note, Journal of Quebec, 1775 105

REVIEWS OF BOOKS 133

NOTES AND NEWS 200

NUMBER 2. JANUARY, 1899.

ARTICLES

HENRI HAUSER	The French Reformation and the French People in the Sixteenth Century	217
FRANK STRONG	The Causes of Cromwell's West Indian Expedition	228
H. MORSE STEPHENS	The Administrative History of the British Dependencies in the Further East	246
GEORGE A. GILBERT	The Connecticut Loyalists	273
ANSON D. MORSE	The Politics of John Adams	292
GEORGE W. JULIAN	The First Republican National Convention	313

DOCUMENTS—Santiago, and the Freeing of Spanish America, 1741; Letters to Caleb Strong, 1786, 1800; Letters to Secretary Chase from the South, 1861 323

REVIEWS OF BOOKS 348

NOTES AND NEWS 395

NUMBER 3. APRIL, 1899.

ARTICLES

	The New Haven Meeting of the American Historical Association	409
EDWARD P. CHEYNEY	The Recantations of the Early Lollards	423
WILLIAM M. SLOANE	Napoleon's Plans for a Colonial System	439
AUSTIN SCOTT	Holmes *vs.* Walton; the New Jersey Precedent	456
GEORGE L. BURR	The Search for the Venezuela-Guiana Boundary	470

DOCUMENTS—The Siege of Charleston; Journal of Captain Peter Russell, 1780 . . . 478

REVIEWS OF BOOKS . . . 502

NOTES AND NEWS . . . 594

NUMBER 4. JULY, 1899.

ARTICLES

CARL E. BOYD	The County of Illinois	623
HENRY C. LEA	Hidalgo and Morelos	636
JOSHUA W. CALDWELL	John Bell of Tennessee	651
JAMES F. RHODES	The Battle of Gettysburg	665

DOCUMENTS—Attempts toward Colonization: the Council for New England and the Merchant Venturers of Bristol, 1621–1623 . . . 678

REVIEWS OF BOOKS . . . 703

NOTES AND NEWS . . . 764

INDEX . . . 780

Volume IV] *October, 1898* [*Number 1*

The

American Historical Review

THE HISTORICAL OPPORTUNITY IN AMERICA

THAT the people of the United States are fond of history is shown by their eagerness to make it, rather than by any habit of turning to the past as furnishing precedents for guidance in times of uncertainty or peril. We are at this moment engaged in an exciting episode of a contest already centuries old; we feel the liveliest interest in the details of the historical drama going on before our eyes; and we understand the importance of keeping an accurate record of the deeds of our popular heroes. We not only require detailed information as to what they say and do in moments of crisis and peril, but we insist on exact statements of what they would have done had circumstances been otherwise, what they declined to do, what they eat and drink or refuse to partake of, how they are clad and how they prepare themselves for a plunge into the sea under an enemy's guns. The events now passing are like the meteorological observations of Arctic travellers or the cases before a crowded court; they accumulate faster than we can dispose of them; and it will require a generation of historical writers to sift the crude materials and to work out the story of our own times.

Side by side with this fierce interest in the events of the day is a disregard, almost an ignorance, of the past history of America. At the end of a quiet and uneventful decade, the nation has suddenly awakened to the possibility of a new career; but it seems disposed to look on the war, its causes and its results, as sudden and unexpected; as something to be met and settled with due reference to the conditions of the end of the nineteenth century, but with an impatient ignoring of the slow development of a Spanish question in the four hundred years which have rolled away since America was discovered. There has been a passionate appeal to principles of foreign intercourse laid down by Washington and Jefferson and Monroe—and but little reference to the historical progress of the Cuban question as shown in almost every volume of our national records. We work over again, in foreign relations as in financial affairs, things which might be supposed to have been settled by the experience of a century. We cheerfully send arms and suggest organization to the Cubans, without troubling ourselves to remember how little aid and comfort we have had from insurgent allies in Canada, in Tripoli, in California, in New Mexico and in Samoa.

Yet the Americans are one of the most conservative of all peoples, and our whole political system rests on a respect for precedent. Without knowing the details of the Spanish-American domination the nation has somehow a consciousness that it has grown to be intolerable. If there be a fault, it is not that of the makers of history, but of the historians, who have failed to set clearly before their countrymen the course of our diplomatic policy; and of historical teachers, who have not imbued their students or pupils with the sense of the sequence of historical events.

Three years ago, in the opening number of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, a writer discussed the attitude of democracy toward the spirit of historical inquiry. Later experience shows no reason for abandoning his conclusions: the great American democracy both makes and records history; and gains in accuracy of vision from decade to decade. At the beginning of the fourth volume of the REVIEW it may be worth while to enter on a humbler inquiry—to see how far public bodies, individuals and societies are performing their task of collecting, preserving and opening up historical materials; what is now doing by American historical scholars to put into systematic form the details of our national history; how far writers are striving to tell the consecutive story of our national life; and what unused opportunities there are for transmitting the knowledge of our memorable past and uplifting present. The field is broad, the material enormous, the workers many, organizations powerful and increasing. What is doing and what may well be done for historical science in America?

Too little attention has so far been paid to the geographical and topographical side of American history; and a prime duty of Americans is the preservation and marking of our historical sites. In foreign cities not only are famous houses carefully preserved, such as Dürer's in Nuremberg and the Plantins' in Antwerp, but memorial tablets everywhere abound. In America some of the stateliest and most memorable buildings have been sacrificed, like the Hancock mansion in Boston; but at present the tendency is to preserve really handsome public and private edifices; and good people everywhere give money and time to keep these causes of civic pride before the eyes of their countrymen. The great incitement to this virtuous work was doubtless the purchase of Mount Vernon by the Ladies' Association, in the fifties, for which purpose Edward Everett coined his silver voice into golden eagles. Among hundreds of instances may be mentioned the restoration of the old Philadelphia city buildings, including Independence Hall; the keeping up the old church at Williamsburg, Va.; the establishment of the Rufus Putnam house at Rutland as a place of pilgrimage; and the repair of Californian convent buildings. Many private owners acknowledge that the historical houses which they inhabit are subject to a kind of public use, like Madison's seat at Montpellier; and some even busy themselves in working out the history of their habitation, and of the famous people who have entered its portals, as has been done by the present owner and occupant of the Craigie House in Cambridge.

By this time the principles which ought to govern the use of an historic building are widely recognized: it should be restored so far as possible to its condition at the time of its greatest historical importance—Carpenter's Hall as it was when the Continental Congress occupied it, and Monticello as Jefferson knew it. It should be called to the attention of the wayfarer by a suitable, permanent tablet of stone or brass; if possible, it should be kept up as a public monument or at least freely opened to public view. It must be admitted that, though most of the buildings of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries which are still preserved have a dignity and beauty which makes them worth keeping as works of art, the nineteenth-century cradles of civil government in the West are not inspiring pieces of architecture, even in the few cases where they have not long ago been replaced. We do not realize that our ancestors went through the same process as ourselves, that they also had to build and rebuild, before they left the comely courthouses and quaint churches and stately dwellings which we now admire.

Even if the building be worthless or destroyed, the site may fitly be commemorated by a permanent inscription. We moderns are so overwhelmed with reading matter that we do not fully understand the effect of inscriptions which stand in public view—the literature of the bookless; yet the noble sentences on the new Congressional Library will be read longer and will have greater influence than any contribution to the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW. There is a citizen of Massachusetts who takes special delight in leading his English visitors to a stone in Arlington which reads:

Near this spot
Samuel Whittemore
Then 80 years old
Killed three British soldiers
April 19, 1775
He was shot, bayoneted
Beaten and left for dead,
But recovered and lived
To be 98 years of age.

However repellent to the British may be the toughness of able-bodied Samuel, the inscription does bring home strongly the force and passion of that April day when, as Sir Edward Thornton pithily stated it, "Englishmen now know that you were fighting our battles." The route from Boston to Concord is designated all the way by memorial stones; and there are many historical marches of the Revolution and the Civil War which deserve like attention.

Tablets upon public buildings or within them are too little regarded in this country, though senseless decorations are not uncommon. For instance, the state house of Connecticut, one of the few beautiful and individual capitols, which might well bear tribute to the founders of the first written constitution of an American commonwealth, is embellished with "a charm" of two thousand tarnished buttons. Compare with this barbaric gewgaw the arms of the podestas which hang on the walls of the court of one of the public palaces at Florence. At the University of Padua the spacious "aula," the stone stairways, and the courts, are adorned with hundreds of coats of arms of noble students; compare this historical monument with the bare walls of the buildings of an ancient seat of learning in Massachusetts, the authorities of which refused to permit a list of distinguished occupants of an eighteenth-century dormitory to be placed upon its walls, because it made distinctions. In the effort to preserve sets of portraits of governors of states and mayors of cities the public recognizes the desire to keep men once honored in the minds of other men. Shall our elder worthies plead in vain before a matter-of-fact generation, "Lord, keep my memory green"?

The time to mark the sites of buildings and the scenes of notable events, the time to note the houses and the rooms once occupied by famous men, is the present, while they can be identified. Many are already lost or disappearing. Who knows where Governor Berkeley roared with official fury? Who marks the college rooms of James Madison, of John Adams or Daniel Webster? A line of white stones in the pavement of the Place de la Republique preserves the outlines of the Bastile; but who stops in his passage through Cincinnati streets to guess the site of Fort Washington? Most of the important battle-fields of the Civil War have been well marked, in the life-time of men who participated; but who has visited or could trace Pigwacket or Camden or Tippecanoe or Resaca de la Palma?

Another service to history and to patriotism would be to catalogue in each state and city the memorable historical sites, with such brief notes as may reveal their significance to the hasty searcher. There are guide-books to Plymouth, possibly to Providence, New Haven or Charleston; but how shall a visitor know the many historical treasures in the out-of-the-way towns of New Hampshire or South Carolina or Kentucky? To record and to catalogue is a necessary task, congenial to the much-abused antiquary, without whom our forefathers would be to us only myths.

Some time a pathway will be blazed for the pilgrim to his country's monuments all the way from Acadia to California; meanwhile something may be done to make the closet historian (if there be any such in this age of realities) acquainted with the appearance of the scenes he describes. The lantern-slide has become an agent of civilization: we ascend the Pyramids on its convenient ray; we traverse Arctic solitudes; we see voiceless guns belching shells at an enemy—may we not also let the lantern be our guide to far-away buildings and battle-fields? Might not those "other people who have nothing to do" get together collections of slides, illustrating their own neighborhood or state? And might not such slides be catalogued and sold in sets, or borrowed and lent, and thus made a part of historical instruction?

Who is to do this work of identification, of marking sites, ot providing the necessary monuments, of preparing photographs and slides? In many places the state or local government will take up the task if properly inspired; and indeed most municipalities are pleased to find that they have spots worth marking. In other cases the work must be done by private societies, whose sole function shall be historical; for though Sons and Daughters of Historical Periods have their usefulness, they do not often promote exact historical work. Among special societies formed to rescue historical sites the first is the admirable Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, which is now doing the work of examining, listing and preserving the memorials of its ancient commonwealth. One of its services is to bring people who have money and good will, but no especial knowledge of the treasures in their neighborhood, into relation with things that need to be done, with such results as the embanking of the remnants of Jamestown Island. Another typical organization is the Harvard Memorial Society, which exists only to search out and mark sites memorable in the history of that university.

Of "monuments" in the narrower sense the country has too many and too few: too many of the type of that marvel of useless stone-cutting, the Soldiers' Monument in Cleveland, forced upon an unwilling city by an artless state legislature; too few like the Shaw Monument in Boston, a really individual and inspiring work of art, which could be set up only for the one man whom it commemorates, and yet through him speaks of the heroism of armies, and raises the moral standard of every man who sees it. Let towns and cities remember Hawthorne's injunction: "The man who needs a monument should never have one."

For the historian the buildings of our ancestors are a lesson and an illustration, but he cares especially for official records of events. The thirteen colonial legislatures, the active town-meetings in New England and the county courts in the South, have furnished a large number of separate records; but, notwithstanding local pride and the pressure of genealogy-hunters, we have nothing approaching complete printed records of a single colony. Many states have worked at the task for years, notably Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts and North Carolina, but the results in most cases are confused or fragmentary. For instance the Massachusetts "resolves" of the provincial period have not been all collected, because the editor could not bring himself to publish simply the texts, but insisted on sending them out to the world embellished with valuable notes. The legislature lost patience after twenty-eight years of publication, which had included only eighty-nine years of statutes and sixteen of resolves, and suspended the whole enterprise. No better field for enlightened lobbying could be found than in persuading legislatures to print their own colonial or early state records, as simply and as expeditiously as is possible, while making accurate transcripts; posterity may be relied upon to furnish the *scholia*.

Local records have been notoriously neglected, and on the whole very few have been printed in full. Boston, Providence, Worcester, Southampton (Long Island) and now New Amsterdam have published the fullest sets. Here again is a field for the friend of history, and the lover of quaint literary extracts. For instance, when you read of the town of Lee that in 1779 its discontented citizens voted that they held themselves "bound to support the Civil Authority of the State for the term of one year," you are tempted to possess a copy of the whole record of that town. The thing is not so difficult as it seems; local newspapers will often gladly publish successive installments of the records, and allow the type to be rearranged in pages for a more permanent publication.

The archives of the states since the end of the Revolution are in a deplorable condition: the records are in many cases badly stored, very few of them are calendared; and in many instances they are almost unknown even to their custodians. When an investigator wishes information out of such collections he can find little if he searches for himself, and he has still less likelihood of getting information by correspondence. To meet this difficulty a plan of co-operation has been suggested; it provides for a kind of interstate board made up of one person from the neighborhood of each state capital, or large city, who should make it his business to learn the ins and outs of the archives, and should select competent searchers and copyists. To such a person the seeker after truth might apply with the certainty that he was dealing with some one who understands his needs and could put him in the way of information and of hiring proper transcribers. The labor required of each of these unofficial archivists would be small; the service to historical study would be great.

In some respects the national archives are in better shape than those of the states; and they contain large masses of material of the utmost importance. In general the custodians of United States documents show much patience and courtesy, but they are too few and too much occupied to do what they would like for the visiting scholar; and in many fields of great importance reasons of state forbid a close search. For instance, the Confederate archives deposited in the War Department have been opened to very few scholars, because of the relation of those papers to claims on the government. The recent appointment of a trained historical scholar as head of the Department of Manuscripts in the Congressional Library is a step which promises to make available much buried material. But even such an official must expect sooner or later to meet the elastic obstinacy which recently defeated a head of a bureau in one of the Departments at Washington, who was armed with unlimited authority from his Secretary to search the records for certain historical material; he found that nothing could overcome the obstinate determination of the custodian, that nobody should invade his documents.

The first necessity with regard to the government archives is to calendar the great series of manuscript material for use *in situ;* the next step is to enter on a scientific publication of certain classes of that material. The proper beginning would be a new critically prepared edition of the *Journals of Congress* from 1775 to 1788; for while selected parts of these journals were printed at the time, and have since been reprinted, and omitted parts were later published separately as the *Secret Journals*, neither set is very accurate. Another prime necessity is a critical edition of the Ordinances of Congress having the force of permanent law, from 1775 to 1788; it is hard to see how the federal courts have got on without such an official publication. Then might well follow selections from the manuscript Reports of Committees and other congressional papers of Revolutionary times. The next step should be the publication of new national editions of the works of the great American statesmen, from the large collection of manuscripts in the archives of Washington, supplemented by other sets held elsewhere. It hardly seems suitable that the Washington, Jefferson and Monroe papers, the property of the government, should contain material known to the public only through very expensive limited editions of private publication. We are grateful for the enterprise which makes such material available in any form; we should be more grateful if the government would itself issue in generous and scholarly editions the works of the great statesmen.

So far as kindly Uncle Sam is concerned there is little hope for an enlightened publication or calendaring of the invaluable materials which he owns, except under powerful organized pressure. Many members of Congress are alive to the importance of opening up the government store-houses, but they must perforce feel the greatest zeal in such matters as constituents press upon them. What is needed is a persistent and widely-diffused understanding of and insistence on the value of these records and the importance of publishing them. Now that the Civil War series is nearing completion, and now that people appreciate the necessity of permanent records of the Spanish war, perhaps the attention of Congress may again be fixed on the records of the Revolution and of the formative period of our government.

What once goes into public archives usually stays there till somebody makes it available; and official custodians presumably at least intend to protect their charge from the dangers to which papers are always exposed—fire, damp, insects and animals, the ravaging autograph-pirate and ignorant destruction. Private manuscripts and rarities have no such traditional protection and are perishing every day. A few perfectly authenticated incidents will show

how little the public realizes the value of written material, even from the collections of public men. Recently some children in Barnstable, Massachusetts—a prosperous and intelligent town—were seen making a bonfire of papers, which had been taken out of a stable-loft or some such receptacle. The holocaust was stopped in time to save about a barrel of documents, which proved to be valuable correspondence of 1765 on the Stamp Act. Upon the death, within fifteen years, of a well-known public man of Missouri—member of Congress during an important period of our national history—his family presented his library of books to a college of the state. The professor of history, knowing that he possessed a unique collection of pamphlets, hastened to ask for them also, but found that all the pamphlets had been burned, "for of course they were of no value." A son of a most distinguished American statesman was applied to for information about one of the rarest of Americana, rightly supposed to be in his deceased father's library, and in surly fashion refused to make search for it; but he afterward found it and violently attacked the searcher for saying truthfully that the document had been "inaccessible."

The pursuit of the papers of the late Chief Justice Chase has in it the materials for one of the veracious law-reports of the late Sherlock Holmes. Mr. Chase was a man who perfectly understood the importance of preserving his papers, who kept careful journals and letter-books, and filed all important letters addressed to him. Here, if anywhere, the path of the investigator ought to be smooth. But the search, begun less than twenty years after the jurist's death, revealed the fact that, through no fault of his family, all these papers had utterly disappeared, and could not be found after patient search in four different cities. One volume of the journals, containing the account of the Cabinet discussion on the Proclamation of Emancipation, was by an accident discovered in the hands of a kinsman, to whom it had been given by a third party, neither of them dreaming of its importance. The letters had reposed for nearly twenty years in the vaults of a trust company, from which they were extracted only by the persistence of a distinguished American historian, who must have greeted them as did Poggio Bracciolini the manuscript of Quintilian in the tower of St. Gall: "I verily believe that if we had not come to the rescue, he must speedily have perished. He was indeed right sad to look upon and ragged, like a condemned criminal, with rough head and matted hair, protesting by his countenance and garb against the injustice of his sentence." The diaries turned up in the hands of an old friend of Mr. Chase in a distant state, and at his decease would probably have been unknown but for the chance finding of a letter of inquiry among the dead man's letters. Important letter-books are still absolutely missing, as well as scrap-books and other illustrative material. It required literally years to resuscitate a part of the papers once so carefully preserved.

How is the public to be educated up to an understanding of the value of historical material? Now and then a collection is rescued from loss or scattering as were the three thousand Jefferson documents recently presented by a descendant of the great Democrat to the Massachusetts Historical Society; but material is perishing every day for lack of intelligent interest in the deeds of our fathers or the memorials of their deeds. One longs for the Mohammedan superstition against destroying the smallest scrap of paper, lest it have written upon it the name of God.

The principal agency for the preservation of papers is the historical societies, whose function will be considered below; but there are several other means of arousing public interest. One is, to set the public schools at work; and a conspicuous example of success is the town of Brookline, Mass., where the pupils of the high school have identified historical sites, have used the unpublished local records, and have even printed some results of their modest investigations. Where there is no such wealth of interesting material as in Brookline, teachers may at least make it a part of their instruction in American history to call the attention of children to the value of manuscript materials, and to encourage their bringing into class for exhibition such interesting letters and papers as they may find in their own family possessions. Sometimes unsuspected treasures will be brought to light, as in the quiet Ohio family in which the head bethought himself of an old land-warrant, which proved to bear a remarkable autograph of President Andrew Jackson.

Local and state commissions, officially appointed, may be very helpful in smelling out forgotten manuscripts; and Massachusetts and Rhode Island have established such commissions, so as to put pressure on the town authorities to preserve their records. Should the interstate archive commission suggested above ever be created, the resident member in each state might eventually become practically such a public conscience himself—with or without official appointment; or he might move public sentiment toward the organization of a record commission.

Manifestly, however, the most effective work in these lines is to be done by a permanent national commission. Since none has ever been created by the government, the American Historical Association in 1895 provided for a body of five persons to be known as

The Historical Manuscripts Commission; and the first volume of the results of their work has appeared in the annual report of the Association for 1896, as a government publication. The energy of the commission is shown not only by this valuable volume, but by its obtaining the right to use the long secluded John C. Calhoun papers, which are to appear in a new volume of the reports. Interest and aid in the work of that commission have been widely secured; what it now needs is the co-operation of local and state societies and the use of more funds than the $500 a year generously voted it by the American Historical Association. The Manuscripts Commission is now at work searching for records of a century or half a century ago; in due time their labors should so affect public sentiment that fifty years hence the historian may find the documents of our own period carefully kept and intelligently opened to his study.

The preservation of historical material will help future writers, but another of the duties of historical students is to work out results. Until about thirty years ago most of the conscious historical writing in this country was either put into elaborate works or into solid articles in periodicals; the monograph was little known. Two influences have since led to keen and intelligent monographic work in the United States: foreign example and the opportunity of publishing in series.

When Charles Kendall Adams in Michigan and Henry Adams in Massachusetts began about the same time in the seventies to introduce the "seminar method" of historical study, they made their students acquainted with the painstaking research in very limited fields which characterizes the German "doctor's dissertations," and they encouraged like study and publication by their students. Then came the influence of the *Johns Hopkins Studies*, the first systematic collection of such detailed work in America. Some brief historical monographs have also been published from time to time in the periodicals of political science, economics and sociology, and several of the universities have now entered on the issue of formal series of monographs on subjects in American history and government, besides the many individual ventures.

The quality of much of this work is high, and many young American scholars are thus preparing the way for future historians. In several respects, however, monographs are less effective than they ought to be. The first defect is duplication, due to the fact that there is no convenient way of finding out either what has been done or what is being done in the subject which the student may select; hence he may discover at the end of his labors that his work is superceded before it is ready. It would greatly serve "the cause" if monograph material, including the more elaborate articles in periodicals, were somehow kept catalogued, so that investigators might learn where to look for light and beginners might know what to avoid. Already the professors of American history in some of the large universities have been induced to combine in preparing an annual co-operative list of the doctor's theses now under way.

Another defect is the slowness with which the most serious and startling gulfs are filled. No subject in American constitutional history is so important as the congressional system of government; yet it is only within three years that we have had any systematic account of either the Committee System, the Senate or the Speaker of the House. We have still absolutely no detailed account of the Confederate States of America or of Spanish diplomacy with the United States. There is no monograph on presidential removals from office, or the Seminole war, or President Grant's relations with the Cuban imbroglio. If some historian of weight would only print his list of desiderata, many aspirants for historical reputation would be amazed at the vast amount which remains to be done.

The more important results of monographic work seem readily to find publishers; but there is a body of shorter or more abstruse works for which there is no regular medium. The American Historical Association has sometimes published such work in its *Papers* or *Annual Report*—for instance, the recent elaborate account of *Proposed Amendments to the Federal Constitution;* and many painstaking pieces of work find refuge in little-read publications of local societies; but the country needs to furnish some kind of opportunity for really scholarly works on American history, which are too brief or too detailed for commercial publication. At present recourse in such cases must ordinarily be had to the writer's pocket, or to the publication fund of his university.

A means of stimulating scientific work in history, very familiar in other countries, is the offering of prizes. Many of the colleges have special prize funds; but competition is usually limited to students of that institution. Mr. John C. Ropes has recently set an example of reform by offering a prize for brief monographs in subjects drawn from Napoleon's career, open to students of several universities. What is now needed, however, is an annual national prize, or series of prizes, offered in such a way as to make success a distinguished honor, so that an award may help a man's whole career. The money value ought to be enough to make it an object, and the circumstances of the award such as to bring the successful contestant's name and work to the knowledge of those interested in history throughout the country.

One of the fundamental needs of American history is a proper general history of the United States, and the ambitious youth can set before himself no task more important or more difficult. Besides the old-fashioned historians like Bartlett and George Tucker, few writers have essayed the task of setting forth the complete history of their country except in brief and ordinarily juiceless text-books. Bancroft spent fifty years in his attempt to "write a history down to his own time" and stopped fifty years back of the date when he first entered on his labors. The next generation of writers, Parkman, Henry Adams, McMaster, Rhodes, Schouler and the rest, have chosen limited fields. Fame, large royalties and national gratitude will be the meed of him who in two or three compact volumes will set forth a scholarly and yet interesting history of the things that have really told in the life of the nation.

Till this new historian come, furnished with the accuracy of Hildreth, the breadth of view of Bancroft, and the style of Parkman, we may perhaps reach the same end by the co-operative method. To fit together the work of many writers in right perspective is always difficult, and in a brief work almost impossible. Justin Winsor's mighty *Narrative and Critical History* is a kind of pudding-stone in which the boulders furnished by the writers are set in a matrix of the editor's learning, which circumfuses and permeates the whole mass. A supplementary volume, covering the last hundred years of our history, would be a boon to historical students; but where is there another master-mind like Winsor's? Nevertheless it is worth considering whether the right kind of combined effort might not enlist six or eight specialists in making a National History of the United States, under the auspices of some acknowledged authority.

Besides a general history we need several careful studies of special phases of American history. First of all we lack a constitutional history of the colonial period, in which the variations of English institutions under the conditions of a new life shall be set forth, and the principle of "the survival of the fittest" shall be applied to our present systems of government. We need quite as much a constitutional history of the Revolution which shall discover the real causes of that great division in the English race, and, at the same time, shall clear up the transition from colonial to state and national government. The germs of our present federal system are to be found in the period from 1775 to 1778; and yet none of the general histories of the period really describes either the state or the national governments of that time; and we have only scattered monographic work. The history of slavery is also still to be written: Von Holst has taken up the political side; but there is room for a dispassionate account of what slavery actually was on the plantation and in the mansion, and how it affected the lives of white men and women. The constitutional side of the Civil War is also to be studied as yet only in brief articles or chapters; we do not know the whole story of the vicissitudes of the constitution in that epoch.

There is a like paucity of the right kind of books on industrial and social life in America. We know what political principles the colonists strove for better than we know what were their moral and business standards. The kinks in the reasoning of our forefathers on such subjects as smuggling, piracy, the slave-trade, and Indian neighbors, are still a puzzle to their descendants. Did the Puritan clergy crack jokes after the Thursday lecture? Did the Pennsylvania German trader water the rum intended for white people? Was the slave-dealer a respected citizen in Georgia? Did the merchant systematically pay his debts to the English manufacturer? Such questions and others more important can be answered only after much delving in colonial archives, much expenditure of gray matter and much wear on modern pens, typewriters and typesetting machines. Land and land-tenure is perhaps the most difficult subject of historical research; yet we really know more about the "hide" and "free and common socage" than about the granting, survey, recording, transfer, quitrents and taxation of colonial land, or the occupation of the West in the early part of our own century. Above all we have no systematic account of the chief concern of millions of our forefathers—their religion. Many are the histories of American churches; nowhere is there an account of religion as a vital, formative force in colonial and federal history. What we need to know about our ancestors, whether English, colonial, or nineteenth-century, is, what did they think was right and wrong in private and public affairs? To give us the means of answering that question is one of the best opportunities open to the coming historian.

Perhaps we cannot expect much further advance in secondary writing till we have better means of reaching the sources and the secondary works already in existence. A boon to every man interested in his country's history would be a discriminating bibliography. To say nothing of the existing single volumes of selected titles, more or less classified, there have been three attempts at American bibliography on a large scale. Sabin's *Dictionary of American Bibliography* has suffered from the same causes as the French Academy's *Dictionnaire:* it attempts a task almost impossible; for in thirty years it has come down only to the letter S. Eventually the rest of the alphabet and a topical index are promised; but at best only a few libraries and individuals are likely to own nearly thirty volumes of a single bibliography. Winsor's *Narrative and Critical History* has become as much an essential for the historical student as Bradford's *History*, or the *Annals of Congress*, or *Niles's Register;* but it leaves almost untilled the Congressional period. Mr. Iles's new enterprise of making up a list of a thousand titles, each with a critical note by an expert, is a step in the right direction on the only feasible method: a limited work, carried through by co-operation.

Neither of these three works fills the place of a scientific yet handy bibliographical manual for the historical student, or would be superseded by such a manual. Here, if anywhere, is opportunity for skillful combination of the labor of many persons. What more suitable task for some historical organization with roots widespread than to enter on the preparation of a bibliography which might include, say ten thousand titles, classified by subjects, and each provided with a note setting forth its value? It is significant that Mr. Iles's plan for a similar work on a smaller scale has proceeded from the libraries and not from the historians. Certainly if a work like Leypoldt's *American Catalogue* goes out of print, and is picked up eagerly at seventy-five dollars a set, such a bibliography as has just been suggested would find nearly all the libraries and historical societies in the country among its purchasers, and would need no charitable support. And a system of annual or continuous indexes of new material, in pamphlets or on printed cards, would put a new tool into the hand of every student.

A good bibliography would not only be bought by libraries, it would help to create them; for it should include lists of historical books in successive, concentric rayons—"the best 50 volumes;" "the best 100 volumes;" "the best 200 volumes," and so on. The formation of collections of historical books, both on American and on foreign topics, is one of the duties which never should be forgotten, for it is the service of the craft to the country. Such collections as those of the Boston Public Library, the Lenox Library, the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, the John Carter Brown Library in Providence, the Burton Library in Detroit are the delight of the investigator; but they are already formed, and are permanent. The task is now to encourage the little town libraries to buy historical books and make them available, and to see to it that city and college libraries have full sets of standard sources, of secondary works and of periodicals.

More than that, this is the time to sweep up local and transient publications, and put them where the next generation will find them safe. Professor Willard Fiske had the pleasure of discovering a literature in his famous collection of books in the Romansch dialects; he got that unique collection together by himself calling from house to house in the Engadine, and bearing away with him all the books that the peasants would sell. The "source method" might be applied in the schools of many country towns in America if they would preserve their valuable material; we want the dusty piles of books out of the garrets; we want the papers in the rubbish heaps in the cellars. It was only the other day that a wayfarer found in a refuse heap near his country home in New Hampshire a perfect map of Cheshire County—now almost impossible to buy; perhaps by digging deeper he might have found Belknap's *History of New Hampshire*, or even an autograph letter of Governor Wentworth. Transient publications, pamphlets, fugitive reports—what the Germans graphically call *Flugschriften*—these are the worry of the tidy housekeeper, and the prize of the local library.

Newspapers too ought to be carefully sought and deposited in libraries. To be sure we may look forward to the time when the whole of Manhattan Island will be required for the storage of the files of the metropolitan Sunday newspapers; but even at that time libraries will still be vainly trying to pick up an odd volume of the *Aurora*, or *Rivington's Gazette*, or *Niles's Register*, or the *Liberator*, to complete sets—a volume which is to-day going to light fires. The good sense of the editors of the *New Jersey Archives* has suggested to them the value of an index which will give a clue to the whereabouts of the most important colonial newspapers, and they have already published several parts of their invaluable key to the colonial issues. The same service might well be performed for the newspapers and rare periodicals down to 1861, and for Confederate newspapers during the Civil War. The need of the day is not more newspapers but some way to find those already published and to get at their contents.

Some of the services of newspapers have been performed by periodicals of various kinds. The *North American Review* from 1815 to 1870 abounded in serious historical articles, and the great illustrated monthlies of the present generation have much valuable material, both sources and secondary; but one of the plainest duties of Americans is to keep up some periodicals expressly devoted to the subject of history. Some such have existed and then ceased to be. Such are Dawson's *Historical Magazine* issued from 1857 to 1875, and the *Magazine of American History* issued from 1877 to

1894. One reason for the discontinuance of these serviceable journals was that they were exclusively American. During the last quarter-century a new spirit has crept into the minds of students of their country's history: they see that it is not a subject disconnected from the general development of the world's history; they appreciate the interest and importance of other fields; they desire the aid of other men who are not so fortunate as to confine their attention to America. Hence all the historical periodicals founded in the last fifteen years have distinctly announced that they deal with foreign as well as American conditions and events.

Taking history in a large sense, as including economic, social and governmental development, there are now in the United States seven special periodicals of which the sole aim is to record and instruct in that field. In this classification no offence is intended to the votaries of Political Science, who consider that their specialty enfolds history, or to the sociologists who hold that sociology includes all other human sciences, although nothing with which they disagree is true sociology. The seven journals are, then: the (Columbia) *Political Science Quarterly;* the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (conducted chiefly by professors of the University of Pennsylvania); the *Yale Review*; the (Chicago) *Journal of Political Economy;* the (Harvard) *Quarterly Journal of Economics;* the (Chicago) *American Journal of Sociology;* and the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW. Although in every case contributions are solicited and received from scholars all over the country, all but one of these journals is a satellite, or rather a double star to some one institution of learning.

That the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW is founded on a basis of general co-operation is due to the self-abnegation of several universities which might have started periodicals of their own, but preferred to join forces with others. Whatever the result of this co-operative system, it seems to the editors the only way of founding a journal which shall presume to be representative of the great body of historical scholars and teachers in America. There are moments when it seems reasonable to hope that by and by other journals will divest themselves of their local character and join their energies in national periodicals; there is even a vision of four quarterlies, so timed that one of them shall come out each month, and covering the four fields of Political Science, Economics, Sociology and History, respectively. The main difficulty in such a fusion of interests is how to arrange for such control and support of the various organs as shall make them all permanent, and genuinely national in spirit and direction.

Since history is not only a pursuit for the learned but a study familiar in schools of every grade, the question of methods of teaching has come to be serious both for historians and for educators. Probably no branch of learning has been habitually worse taught in America: methods of parrot repetition of stale text-book phrases have crept all the way up from the district school to the university. Even the notion of reading standard historical works as collateral to the text-books found a lodgment in the minds of college professors only about thirty years ago. To improve the teaching of history in schools, we must look, as a preliminary, to a more enlightened public opinion on the preservation and use of materials.

At present most of the well-known writers of history in America are either teachers of the subject or at least lecturers to college students; hence, there is a kind of pedagogical turn to much of the discussion in historical assemblages. College teaching has steadily improved under the influence of men themselves trained where history was properly taught—either at home or abroad; and history in colleges may now be trusted to care for itself. It is otherwise with teaching in schools, which is often of a character to justify the confused school-boy who once recorded for the writer's information that "The greatest men of Carthage were Hamilcar and Hannibal Hamlin;" or the other ingenious youth who said more than he was aware of when he asserted that "the Social War was fought in Bacteria."

To raise the schools out of the slough three influences have been at work: that of teachers who wanted to teach something; that of college authorities who framed entrance examinations in history; and that of historical investigators who saw the absurdities of the rote system. These influences converged in the first attempt to give national currency to ideas of reform, the Report of the Madison Conference on History and Government, made to the Committee of Ten in 1893. A second general conference was held at Columbia in 1896, made up of representatives of six universities and six secondary schools. It framed a new scheme of entrance requirements in history which laid emphasis on collateral reading and written work, and asked for recognition by the colleges of a good and extended school course in history. The scheme thus recommended has already been substantially adopted by Cornell, the University of Pennsylvania, Tufts, Wellesley, and Harvard. A third discussion of the subject has been that of the Committee of Seven, appointed by the American Historical Association in 1896, now engaged in the work of drafting school-programmes which will meet proper college requirements, and expected to report to the Association in December, 1898. The outlook for a great increase of interest and efficiency in school history is therefore encouraging; and the necessary specialist teachers are now being trained in the universities and colleges throughout the land. New text-books of much merit have also been produced, most of them by men who are experts in the subjects which they discuss; and collateral reading has been made available in great variety. The result must be an intelligent interest throughout the country in historical records and historical writing.

The historical opportunity in the United States is appreciated; to carry the good work farther a proper organization of scattered forces is necessary. The natural centres of activity are the local historical societies; but there seems to be something in the nature of history which causes such associations to ebb, before they have reached high tide. To carry them on successfully, it is essential to develop intelligent, trained and interested directors, both men and women. Here is a career ready for some of those graduates of women's colleges, whose preparation seems wider than their later opportunities. In history, as in all subjects pursued in the scientific method, trained experts and enthusiasm are both essential.

Local societies can of course accomplish most for their own neighbors, especially in places that have interesting sites, or stores of unpublished manuscripts, or buried treasures of rare books. It will be a century before the society of any town or city will have marked all the spots that ought to be commemorated, and by that time there will be another century's accumulation. The state societies, with a few exceptions, have not reached the measure of their opportunities to help their communities and their country, some of them have become genealogical mills and others are reposing on the reputation of past publications. They have a great field and only need to be roused to their work. To give an example of the place which they might have in the public mind, the first thought of any intelligent person into whose hands comes manuscript of any kind should be: "Would the state society accept this? or receive it? or deposit it? or publish it?" Valuable material ought to reach these societies as certainly as meteorites reach a mineralogical museum, for on the state societies rests the responsibility of keeping the sources from perishing. Perhaps the usefulness of the societies may be increased by the plan suggested by Professor Salmon of Vassar, for inducing them to enter into a kind of confederation, so as to secure mutual understanding and work on common lines.

One of the most hopeful signs in the historical field is the growth in members and influence of the American Historical Association, the only national society devoted exclusively to historical aims. Although not founded until 1884, it has already become a kind of clearing-house for historical efforts, and its large brotherhood of scattered members come together in meetings which give valuable opportunities of acquaintance with other members of the craft, and which concentrate attention on historical problems. The meetings of 1896 in New York and 1897 in Cleveland were like those of a large club for good fellowship, and brought out lively discussions on interesting topics. But these two meetings, and that of 1895 at Washington, are chiefly memorable for the deliberate acceptance of new functions. Besides issuing the *Annual Report* (published by the government) the Association in the three successive years has instituted the Historical Manuscripts Commission, set up a prize which has since been once awarded, created the Committee of Seven on history in schools, and considered the question of taking over the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, an arrangement which the editors desire in the interests both of the periodical and of the Association; for all these laudable purposes the Association added works to faith by making generous grants of money. Whether the Association will go forward to assume any of the other labors which are waiting for an impulse is yet to be determined; but there is an injunction as well as a promise in the Scriptural suggestion: "To him that hath shall be given."

Plentiful are the American organizations which are trying to foster historical studies in multifarious directions; there is no lack of men or of organization, and will be none of material to work upon; for the next century will not be less exciting than that just expiring. Since behind records must stand things worthy of record, we may depend on the Hobsons and the Roosevelts to help make memorable history, just as John Paul Jones and Hull built up their country's renown. Perhaps a Central American contest may eventually overshadow the Mexican War; or the revolt of our distant colonies may one day cause us at last to understand our own Revolution. We may leave it to later generations fitly to perpetuate the stirring events of our own time and of the future; our present duty is simply to follow the principle of the Cambridge town meeting of 1765 in its vote on the Stamp Act: "That this vote be Recorded in the Town Book that the Children yet unborn may see the desire their Ancestors had for their freedom and happiness."

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART.

THE EXECUTION OF THE DUC D'ENGHIEN

II.

On March 12, two days after he had ordered the Duc d'Enghien to be seized, the First Consul retired to the quiet and seclusion of Malmaison to unravel without interruption the last threads of the plot against his life, and to direct at the same time from a little distance the vengeance which he was determined to take upon all those whom he imagined connected with it. It was there, as we have seen, that he received the courier, Thibaud, announcing that the arrest was about to be made, and in reply sent orders that Enghien and Dumouriez were to be brought to Paris at once. It was from Malmaison also that he wrote the letter to Réal which has been cited above,[1] in which he told him to inquire of the commandant of Vincennes whether there was room to lock up the prisoners in that castle. This letter to Réal proves that already on March 15, even before he had heard that the Duc had actually been arrested, Bonaparte had made up his mind to send him to Vincennes instead of to the Temple, where Moreau and Georges were, and where state prisoners were ordinarily confined. He had further made up his mind, and this is the heaviest charge against Bonaparte and the one for which history will censure him most severely, that the Duc d'Enghien should not have the fair, open trial at Paris which justice and the law naturally accorded to a man accused of political conspiracy. Instead he was secretly handed over to a court-martial on the very night of his arrival in Paris, given a trial which outraged the name of justice, and sent to his death at once. Why did Bonaparte thus basely deny to the Duc d'Enghien the fair trial which was granted to Georges and his comrades? Because he knew Georges was a guilty man and would justly be convicted in a fair trial, but did not feel that the same was true of the Duc. There were many reasons which made him regard it as doubtful whether the regular tribunal at Paris could be induced to convict him. The violation of the electoral territory would furnish the Duc's advocates with an easy and strong line of defence, which would be backed up by the foreign diplomatic agents. Then again, as Cambacérès had

---

[1] Bonaparte to Réal, March 15, *supra*, Vol. III., pp. 639, 640.

R14426

suggested, public opinion in Paris, always fickle and uncertain, might turn in the Duc's favor and prevent his being put to death. A few days later Bonaparte publicly declared: "I ordered the prompt trial and execution of the Duc d'Enghien in order that the émigrés who had returned to Paris, and who in their hearts might have favored a change in favor of the Bourbons, might not be led into temptation. I feared that the long delays of a trial and the solemnity of condemnation might revive sentiments they could not have refrained from exhibiting, and I should have been obliged to hand them over to the Police"[1]—very kind and thoughtful, to be sure, on the part of the First Consul. He further feared, especially after he had read the Duc's papers and saw how little there really was in them to convict him, that the regular course of justice, with its slow and measured procedure, which fairly examined and weighed all evidence, would never sentence the Duc to death.

If his victim escaped from his hands after all he would have already violated international law to no purpose; he would have given the Bourbons and their followers a triumph; and—a point on which he was always sensitive—he would have made a false step and exposed himself to the censure of Paris and the ridicule of Europe. This was the reason for which he had determined to send the Duc before a court-martial of military officers. This tribunal owed its origin to terrible times, having been fashioned by the Convention to execute its vengeance. Its judgments were executed within twenty-four hours; there was no appeal from them. There was little likelihood that the Duc d'Enghien would leave its clutches unharmed. The diplomatic agents would not intervene and protest, nor could public opinion be roused to save the unhappy man, for he would be executed before the public knew anything about it. The blow would be startling at first, but it would live in the imagination of men for a long time as a warning.

As early as March 16 Bonaparte had consulted with Murat as to the composition of the military court which was to sit at Vincennes and try the Duc d'Enghien and Dumouriez.[2] For he was still of the opinion that Dumouriez was undoubtedly at Ettenheim, and he naturally continued to think so until Saturday, March 17, and even the greater part of that day, until the arrival late in the afternoon of the courier from Strasburg bearing the series of reports from Caulaincourt, Ordener, and Charlot, telling in detail of the success of the expeditions to Ettenheim and Offenburg. From these numerous reports it became certain that the Marquis de Thumery had occasioned the mistake about Dumouriez's name. This gross blunder must have caused the First Consul some chagrin and surprise, but it would be a great mistake to suppose that his convictions with regard to the Duc were at all disconcerted or shaken. The Duc d'Enghien still appeared to him to be a man of the sort of which he had already determined him to be—young, bold, and injudicious; just the man to take part in a conspiracy and lead an invasion of France. In Charlot's report Bonaparte read that it had only been the coolness of one of his companions that prevented the Duc from shooting Charlot. According to the same information the Duc's opinions were not less violent than his acts: "The Duc d'Enghien esteems Bonaparte as a great man; but being a prince of the Bourbon family, he has vowed an implacable hatred to him, as well as to the French, against whom he will make war on all occasions."[1] A man who used such language as this, thought Bonaparte, ought not to be left at large if it could be helped. Though the supposed presence of Dumouriez at Ettenheim had contributed largely to bring about the arrest of the Duc, yet on the other hand the proven absence of Dumouriez did not in Bonaparte's mind in any way establish the innocence of the Duc, and he must suffer.

---

[1] Miot de Mélito, *Mémoires*, II. 156–7 (Paris, 1858).

[2] Boulay de la Meurthe, p. 210.

It was in this frame of mind that the First Consul heard mass at the Tuileries on Passion Sunday[2] and then returned to Malmaison. Josephine, being in a separate carriage with Madame de Rémusat, her lady in waiting, was uneasy, and finally confided to her companion the cause of her unhappiness: Bonaparte had just told her that the Duc d'Enghien had been seized on the frontier and was being brought to Paris to be tried. "I have done what I could," she continued, "to induce him to promise me that the Prince's life shall not be taken, but I fear his mind is made up."[3] This is still one more piece of evidence tending to show that Bonaparte had from the first formed the irrevocable decision to put the Duc to death.

The remainder of Sunday at Malmaison passed quietly. Early the next morning, or possibly very late the same night, a third courier arrived from Strasburg, bringing to Bonaparte the Duc's papers and the *procès-verbal* of their opening and examination by Charlot and Popp; these were the papers which had been despatched Saturday afternoon from Strasburg. Without summoning Réal or any other minister to help him, Bonaparte set himself to work to look over the papers. His eyes fell finally upon a draught of the note which the Duc had sent to Mr. Stuart to deliver to the English government two months before. It laid bare the plans of the Prince and bore witness to his obstinate and persistent desire to fight against the First Consul under the English flag. Two phrases especially impressed themselves upon the indignant mind of the First Consul; that in which the Duc called the French people "his most cruel enemy," and that in which he declared that "a residence of two years near the frontier had given him an opportunity to communicate with the troops that were on the Rhine."[1] What was Bonaparte to think of such sentiments, and this apparent tampering with the loyalty of French troops? Then there were not a few eager offers of service from men who had already served in the Army of Condé or other old companions of the Duc, for his circular letter reporting England's announcement that their pensions were to be doubled had given rise to a renewed activity in their correspondence. There were letters of this kind from Alsace, from Switzerland, and even from Holland, full of plans and advice, often wrongheaded, to be sure, and often incomprehensible, but nevertheless containing much that a prejudiced mind could easily imagine to be treasonable. Though he did not find anything to show that the Duc knew of the Cadoudal conspiracy or had any connection with Dumouriez, he probably reasoned that it made no difference to him whether the Duc knew of the plot or not, so long as he persisted in waiting upon the frontier of France for a favorable opportunity to invade Alsace, such as the assassination of the First Consul would afford. As the conspiracy had been known to the public now for more than a month, the Duc could not have been ignorant of it; why did he still remain within three leagues of France, when he must have known that it was not safe after all that had been discovered, unless he were about to lead a hostile force into Alsace or create a rebellion there? Reasoning in this way, and allowing his prejudiced mind to be influenced by apparent facts without fairly weighing both sides of the evidence, Bonaparte may have tried to satisfy his conscience that his already fixed opinion of the Duc's guilt was confirmed by the Duc's own papers, and that he ought to be put to death.

---

[1] Charlot's report, *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, p. 232.

[2] He had come from Malmaison to Paris on Saturday to transact business; it was at the Tuileries that the courier who brought Charlot's report and the other news from Strasburg found him.

[3] Rémusat, *Mém.*, I. 312 (Paris, 1880).

---

[1] Rereading the Duc's letter (*supra*, Vol. III., p. 623), it will be seen that these are not the exact phrases that he used, though the meaning is equivalent; they are the phrases that Bonaparte used in the set of questions which he prepared for Réal to ask the Duc (*infra*, pp. 33, 34). We cannot know in most cases exactly what Bonaparte found in the Duc's papers, for they have all disappeared; but we may have some idea of what it was, for this set of questions, which Bonaparte surely did not make up out of his own head, must have been partly at least suggested to him by what he found in the Duc's papers. We know exactly what was in the note to Stuart, because it is in the Austrian Record Office.

As a matter of fact there was nothing in all these papers that could justify the Duc's seizure in a neutral territory and his subsequent condemnation and execution. Not only was there no proof of complicity in a plot, but there was the Duc's categorical denial of such complicity,—he had no other intentions than to serve in war and make war. Charlot, who examined the papers at Strasburg, affirmed to Ségur that in all the Duc's correspondence he saw no traces of any connivance with the plot at Paris; he found nothing more than the proof of a gathering of émigrés on the right bank of the Rhine and communications held with the left bank.[1] The Duc's plans reached back for more than two years, long before the conspiracy of Georges; they followed the progress of the war and not of the conspiracy; there had been no definite preparation of money nor arms, nor any regular organization of troops which could at all threaten the safety of the state or the First Consul. That there was really no evidence against the Duc that could justly condemn him must have been recognized by Bonaparte on March 19 after the examination of the papers, although, as has just been said, he may have tried to convince his conscience, and always afterwards asserted in public, that in executing the Duc d'Enghien he was executing a guilty conspirator. The proof of this is that he did not send any of these papers, not even the *procès-verbal* of the opening of the papers, to the court-martial as evidence for the use of the judges; for he knew that they would not, in all probability, be so shameless and grossly unjust as to condemn a man to death when they saw that there was nothing in his papers to convict him. What did Bonaparte do with these papers, which, if made public, would show the people of France that the Duc d'Enghien did not merit death at all, but at the very worst only detention as a hostage till peace was made? He sent them to Réal and told him and Desmarêts to keep them in absolute secrecy, and not let the slightest news of what they contained be made public.[2] Réal obeyed his master so well that they never saw the light afterwards; the judges at the trial did not know of their existence. To have sent them the papers would have given rise to debates and would have necessitated the presence of a defending lawyer and witnesses. All this would have caused delay and endangered the sentence of condemnation. This fear of delay and openness, and Bonaparte's knowledge that there was nothing very incriminating in the Duc's papers, explains why they were kept secret instead of being sent to the persons who ought to have had them.

---

[1] Ségur, *Mém.*, II. 258.

[2] " . . . Je vous recommande de prendre en secret avec Desmarêts connaissance de ces papiers. Il faut empêcher qu'il ne soit tenu aucun propos sur le plus ou moins de charges que contiennent ces papiers. . . ." Bonaparte to Réal, March 19; *Corr. de Nap.*, 7631.

On Tuesday morning, March 20, as the Duc d'Enghien was drawing near Paris, Bonaparte drove from Malmaison to the Tuileries, as his habit often was, in order more easily to attend to affairs of state. Having already made up his mind on March 15 to send the Duc to Vincennes and on March 16 to have him tried by a court-martial, he now dictated in a Council of State the following decree:

"*Article I.* The *ci-devant* Duc d'Enghien, accused of having borne arms against the Republic; of having been, and still being, in the pay of England; and of taking part in the plots woven by this latter power against the interior and exterior safety of the Republic, is to be brought before a court-martial composed of seven members named by the Governor of Paris and sitting at Vincennes.

"*Article II.* The Grand Judge, the Minister of War, and the Governor of Paris are charged with the execution of the present decree."

"BONAPARTE."[1]

In accordance with this decree Murat, Governor of Paris, chose the seven members of the court-martial: Bazancourt, Ravier, Barrois, Rabbe, Guiton, colonels of regiments garrisoned in Paris; and, in addition to these five, General Hulin, an ardent patriot who had assisted at the taking of the Bastille, was chosen to act as president of the court-martial, and Dautancourt, major of gendarmes, as judge-advocate (*capitaine-rapporteur*). These seven men, in order that everything concerning the Duc might be done as secretly as possible and no rumors get abroad before the deed was completed, did not receive notice from the Minister of War to go to Murat's house till late in the afternoon. They came immediately one by one to Murat, and each was told that he was to form part of a court-martial, "which is to meet as soon as possible at Vincennes, to judge there, without leaving the spot, an accused man on the charges given in a decree of the government, which will be sent to the president."[2] They thereupon betook themselves separately to Vincennes, each wondering who the accused might be, but with not the faintest idea that it was a Bourbon prince.

On Tuesday afternoon about five o'clock, that is, just after he had received notice that the Duc was at the barrier of Paris, Bonaparte sent for Savary, who had just returned from Biville in Normandy, and told him that he was to take a brigade of troops from Paris to Vincennes, guard the place, and execute the decision of the court-martial which he would find there. But as Murat was governor of Paris and of the troops stationed there, Savary was also given a letter from the First Consul, which he was to deliver to Murat. Murat read the letter and may have given Savary some further directions about the troops of which he was to have charge.[1] Bonaparte had chosen Savary for this mission because he knew of his devotion to himself, and because he knew that he would have no scruples in executing the decision of the court-martial without delay. Savary arrived at Vincennes about eight o'clock in the evening, and, having stationed his troops around the chateau, saw the seven members of the court-martial arrive separately. By eleven o'clock these eight men had gathered around the fire in Harel's room; with them was Brunet, Murat's aide-de-camp, who had just arrived with the government's decree of accusation. Everything being now ready, Major Dautancourt went into the next room, where the Duc d'Enghien was sleeping soundly, and waked him for a preliminary examination.

---

[1] *Archives nationales*, AF^{IV} 915 (quoted by Welschinger, p. 313).

[2] ". . . Cette commission se réunira sur-le-champ au château de Vincennes, pour y juger, *sans désemparer*, le prévenu sur les charges énoncées dans l'arrêté du gouvernement, dont copie sera mise au président.—J. Murat."—Nougarède, II. 93; *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, p. 93.

It has often been supposed that Bonaparte intended that Réal, who had seen the Duc's papers and was fully acquainted with the whole affair, should be present at the trial and guide the judge-advocate, Dautancourt, in his work;[2] for Réal knew something about legal forms, while Dautancourt did not, and Réal knew the points which might best be brought up against the accused. This question is discussed below; for the present it is enough to say that Réal was not at Vincennes, and Dautancourt was left to blunder along as best he could. The only two documents that he had to guide him in interrogating the Duc were (1) Murat's order that the court-martial should try the accused without leaving the spot, and (2) the decree of the government which charged the Duc with three things; with having borne arms against the Republic, with being in the pay of England, and with taking part in the Cadoudal conspiracy.[1] The judge-advocate considered this decree as his guide, and contented himself with asking the Duc some needless questions on these three points, which were answered frankly and explicitly by the Duc. That he was an émigré and had fought in the Army of Condé was a fact well known to Dautancourt and all who were acquainted with the revolutionary wars. In answer to the second charge the Duc said he did receive money from England, but it was as a pension, which was given him as his only means of support, and not as wages for serving England in war. Lastly, he disdainfully repudiated the idea that he could have had anything to do with a conspiracy. He declared that he had never seen Pichegru nor Dumouriez, nor had the slightest relations with them; he was glad that he had not, if it was true that they had used the vile means which were reported. He said that he corresponded with his father and grandfather in England and with some old friends in France, not on political projects, but solely on personal matters.[2] The judge-advocate, thinking that he had asked enough for form's sake, requested the Duc to sign the *procès-verbal* of the answers he had just given, for by French law his own evidence is read to the accused and he signifies his admission that it is correctly reported by signing the document. The Duc wrote:

---

[1] Savary, in 1823, actuated by a feeling of spite and a desire to heap calumny on every one else who had been in any way connected with the Enghien affair, in order to draw attention away from his own share in the matter, accuses Murat of having given him the orders about taking the troops to Vincennes, in accordance with the directions just received in the letter from Bonaparte. He says that he did not even know, when he left Malmaison, that the Duc had been seized, nor what was contained in the letter of which he was the bearer. But Pasquier (I. 204 *seq.*) and the recently published notes of the Comte de Mosbourg in *Murat, Lieutenant de l'Empereur en Espagne* (Paris, 1897), pp. 437–445, leave no doubt that Savary, as his whole later conduct tends to show, was carrying out the will of his master, the First Consul, and had got his orders from him and not merely from Murat. He probably knew, too, the contents of the letter, which Pasquier (p. 204) says contained "the most formal orders not only to have the Duc tried and sentenced, but not to suffer any delay to occur in his execution and to anticipate all preparations." It was only in consequence of this second peremptory order from Bonaparte that Murat was finally forced to give the order for the assembly of the military commission to sit at Vincennes and judge the prisoner "*sans désemparer.*" For on that same Tuesday morning, when the first message came to him about eleven o'clock from Bonaparte asking him to appoint the men for the military commission, he indignantly refused, exclaiming, "What! are they trying to soil my uniform! I will not tolerate such a thing. Let him [Bonaparte] appoint them himself if he wants to." Bonaparte accordingly did so. Pasquier, I. 206; also completely confirmed in detail by Comte de Mosbourg's note.

[2] As a civilian Réal could have taken no formal part in the proceedings of a court-martial; but he could, of course, have been present and made suggestions to Dautancourt.

"Before signing this *procès-verbal*, I earnestly request that I may have an interview with the First Consul. My name, my rank, my way of thinking, and the horror of my situation, lead me to hope that he will not refuse my request.

---

[1] It will be remembered that Bonaparte had told Réal to suppress the Duc's papers. A contemporary account of the proceedings says that Hulin "had the prisoner led in free and without handcuffs, and ordered the judge-advocate to read the documents both in favor of and against the accused, *to the number of one*." This one document was the decree of the government. (*Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, p. 100; also Welschinger, 325.) Savary also admits (*Mémoires*, II. 394) that Hulin could produce only one document, the decree of the government, against the Duc; but that this was all that was necessary; more or less evidence would have made no difference in the result, because Hulin, when chosen president of the commission, was given to understand that the accused must be condemned.

[2] Dupin's pamphlet on the trial, printed in *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien;* also Appendix V. of Scott's *Life of Napoleon*.

"L. A. H. de Bourbon."

When the interrogatory was thus completed, the prisoner was brought unshackled into the room where the court-martial was sitting ready to perpetrate an atrocious crime in the name of Justice.

It was a little after midnight. The light of a few flaring torches fell across the faces of the seven ministers of death. Brunet, Murat's aide-de-camp, stood at one side. Savary, like a vulture waiting for its prey, hovered ominously behind the chair of the president, eager to prevent any delay or hesitation on the part of the judges.

That the trial took place in the secrecy of night was in itself irregular. But this was by no means the only irregularity and injustice of the proceedings. By military law the prisoner was entitled to a copy of the charges, the services of a defending advocate, and sufficient time to prepare his defence; all these necessary rights were denied him. There were no witnesses nor was there any evidence worthy of the name. Still worse, according to Hulin's own admission neither he nor any of the other members of the court knew anything about law and judicial procedure; they owed their position merely to what they had done on the field of battle; they had not "*la moindre notion en matière de jugemens.*"[1] The mockery of forms which now followed outrages the name of a judicial trial; it consisted simply of a cross-examination of the Duc from his own answers to the interrogations just put to him by Dautancourt. He proudly repeated what he had already said, repudiating the charge of having directly or indirectly taken part in a plot to assassinate the First Consul; he acknowledged that he had upheld the rights of his family, and said that a Condé could enter France only with arms in his hand. "My birth and my opinions will always make me the enemy of your government," he added with such unnecessary boldness, inspired by a feeling of pride in his ancestors and complete confidence in his own innocence, that Hulin said warningly: "From the way you answer, you seem to be mistaken as to your real position; take care; this will become serious, and court-martials give judgments from which there is no appeal." The Duc was silent for a moment; then he raised his head and said, "I know it; I ask only to have an interview with the First Consul."[2]

The cross-examination concluded, the prisoner was led out again and the court deliberated in secret as to the sentence. One exceptional circumstance in the trial well justified delay; this was the request of the Duc for an interview with the First Consul. One of the judges, Barrois, was in favor of granting the request; but Hulin, who the evening before had had a long conference with Bonaparte,[1] and knew well that a sentence of death and a speedy execution were expected by him, was opposed to granting the request; the other judges also favored an immediate sentence in accordance with Murat's order that they were to complete their work "*sans désemparer*." Savary was consulted, as knowing better than any one else the intentions of Bonaparte; he represented that such a delay would be "inopportune" and displeasing to the First Consul.[2] The hint was sufficient, and the judges decided that the Duc should be condemned to death without delay. It remained only to write the sentence. But this was no easy matter, for the main charge, that of complicity in the conspiracy, was not only unproved by any evidence, but was directly denied by the Duc's clear statement. In writing out the sentence, this idea of complicity in the plot had to be omitted, and the judges, taking the Duc's answer as a basis, tried to draw up a sentence which could fit the facts and yet make the Duc liable to the penalty of death. Many drafts were made before they got one that they thought would do. According to the regular form the sentence ought to mention the exact law under which the accused was found guilty. The judges had an idea that there was some revolutionary law which condemned to death émigrés who had fought against their country, but they were quite ignorant of its exact wording or where to find it.[3] To look it up would be a work of some difficulty and cause delay. It was necessary that the Duc should be found guilty and executed immediately, unless they wished to incur the displeasure of the First Consul. It would, therefore, be time enough, after the Duc was dead and buried, to consider under what law he had suffered, and to fill out the blanks accordingly. One would have thought civilized men could not be guilty of such an act, but here is the judgment to speak for itself:—"The prisoner was led out; the court having deliberated with closed doors, and the president having collected the votes of the members, beginning with the youngest and voting himself last, the prisoner was unanimously found guilty; and in accordance with article (*blank*) of the law (*blank*) to the following effect (*blank*), was condemned to suffer death. Ordered, that the judge-advocate see that the present sentence is executed immediately."[1] This was signed by the seven judges, though not by the clerk as it ought to have been.

---

[1] Hulin's *Explications offertes aux hommes impartiaux*, in *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, p. 118.

[2] Hulin's *Explications*, p. 120.

---

[1] Rémusat, *Mémoires*, I. 323; Savary also distinctly asserts (*Mémoires*, II. 399) that Hulin some years later, in exile at Brussels, when questioned about his conduct in the Enghien affair, said, "I only acted in consequence of the most severe instructions. The possibility that the Duc would demand an interview with the First Consul was foreseen and I was forbidden to allow such a demand to be presented to the government." The truth of the last part of this statement of Savary is doubtful.

[2] Hulin's *Explications*, p. 119.

[3] The law they were thinking of was that of 25 Brumaire, An III., tit. 5, sect. 1, art. 7, which provided that "émigrés who have borne arms against France shall be arrested, whether in France or in any hostile or conquered country, and judged within twenty-fours," etc. But the Duc was neither arrested in France nor within the precincts of any hostile or conquered country, but was seized by force illegally in a country in friendly relations with France, so that this law was not applicable to him. Even had he been arrested in a hostile country, it would have been unjust and ridiculous to sentence him to death on the ground of this law, for it had long been a dead letter; it was no longer looked upon as a crime to have fought against France from 1792 to 1799; the revolutionary war was a thing of the past; the great mass of émigrés had been amnestied; it was part of Bonaparte's wise policy to encourage exiles to return; and many of the old soldiers of Condé were now in the ranks of the French army or had become ornaments of the consular court.

Then, if we are to believe Hulin's statement, the judges were a little ashamed of the base piece of work they had done, and all agreed that Hulin should write a letter to Bonaparte, telling him of the Duc's request for an interview, and begging him "to remit a sentence which the rigor of our position did not allow us to avoid." At this moment Savary approached Hulin, and, seeing what he was doing, snatched away the pen, saying, "Your part is over; the rest belongs to me."[2]

The Duc was awaiting the decision of the court in the next room without fear and even without impatience, when Harel entered with a troubled face and motioned him to follow. After a few steps they emerged into the open court, and saw by the flickering light of torches that they were face to face with a squad of soldiers whom Savary had drawn up. An adjutant advanced and read the sentence to the Duc, who heard it with firmness and self-possession. He asked for a priest, but this was denied him. Ever thoughtful of her who was to mourn so much for him, he asked for a pair of scissors, cut off a lock of his hair, slipped off his ring, and gave them with a note to an officer, who promised to deliver them to the Princess de Rohan. The squad of soldiers advanced. The Duc begged them above all things not to miss their aim. He bent his head in prayer a moment and commended his soul to his Maker. He looked up again bravely into the mouths of the loaded muskets. An instant later the shots rang out and the innocent man fell dead, shot through the heart.

---

[1] Dupin's pamphlet in *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, 101; also in App. V. of Scott's *Life of Napoleon*.

[2] Hulin's *Explications*, p. 123; also Pasquier, I. 201.

A few steps away was a hole which had been dug in the ground the day before in accordance with Harel's orders; whether he intended it as a grave, knowing that the Duc would surely be shot, or whether it was merely to put some rubbish in, as was said twelve years later by the man who dug it, is uncertain.[1] Into this hole the Duc was pitched with all his clothes on, his feet higher than his head,[2] and the earth was thrown in again. The death and burial took place by torchlight between three and four o'clock in the morning.[3] Thus the trial and execution were both in the dark and secrecy of night, and were marked by the same unseemly haste and cruel injustice that characterized all the First Consul's orders for the destruction of an unfortunate man whose crime, as Savary himself acknowledged, consisted in his being the Duc d'Enghien.

What was the account given to Paris of the proceedings of the court-martial? They were too disgraceful to be told; all that appeared in the *Moniteur* the next morning was a copy of the judgment supposed to have been rendered.[4] This, however, was not the shameful sentence of death, full of blanks and irregularities, which was to be executed "*de suite*," and under which the Duc had really been sent to his death. For when Réal brought a copy of that outrageous document to Bonaparte, he saw that it would never do to make it public.[5] Instead he took as a basis the questions that he had sent to Réal, and wrote out a new indictment and sentence, which differed wholly from the real judgment.[6] This new copy, which was the one published in the *Moniteur*, accused the Duc on six different grounds and found him guilty on each. Several of these had absolutely no connection with the charge upon which the Duc had been arrested; the rest were unsupported by evidence, as for instance, the last, which we quote to show the falsity of the document with which Bonaparte wished to deceive the public: "The court declares the Duc d'Enghien . . . (6) unanimously, guilty of being one of the accomplices of the conspiracy carried on by the English against the life of the First Consul; and intending in the event of the success of such conspiracy to enter France."

---

[1] Bourrienne (II. 269) asserts positively that Harel told him he had received orders the day before the execution to have a grave dug ready for the corpse.

[2] He was so found twelve years later, when his body was exhumed and given a decent burial in the chapel at Vincennes. The account of the exhumation and of the evidence taken at that time is given in *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, pp. 301–324.

[3] This is proved by an extant letter from Hulin to a friend, quoted by Welschinger (p. 339). Ségur also relates that he met Dautancourt early that same morning at General Duroc's, whither both had gone to make their report, and heard him say, "He was shot in the moat at three o'clock in the morning." (Ségur, *Memoirs of an Aide-de-Camp*, p. 112.)

[4] *Moniteur*, 1 Germinal (March 22, 1804).

[5] "The official report of the judgment was presented to Napoleon the same day [March 21]. The perusal of this document was a subject of fresh grief to him. Legal forms had not been respected. The irregularities and omissions which he noticed in it caused him to order it to be rewritten." Méneval, I. 262.

[6] Pasquier, I. 199; Dupin's pamphlet, pp. 82–85; Appendix to Scott's *Napoleon;* and in *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, p. 259, we read, "le jour même de l'exécution du Prince on en rédigea *un autre jugement* dans les bureaux de Réal. C'est celui-ci, et non l'original de la commission, qui fut affiché le lendemain."

After the execution was over and the judges had dispersed, Savary sent the troops back to their barracks, and started for Malmaison to tell his master what had been done. When he reached the barrier he saw Réal's carriage and stopped him to ask him where he was going. "To Vincennes," Réal replied; "I received last night orders to go there and interrogate the Duc d'Enghien." Savary told him what had taken place. Savary says he was as much astonished himself at what he heard from Réal as Réal was at what he heard from him. Réal's reflection, after a moment, was, "Le Premier Consul sera furieux." But Savary having undertaken to see Bonaparte first,[1] Réal turned his carriage around and followed at a little distance, fearful of the reception which he would meet.[2] Savary arrived at Malmaison, was at once ushered into the First Consul's study, and related in a few words what had been done.[3] On hearing that the Duc had asked to see him, the First Consul interrupted him to ask what had become of Réal and whether he had not gone to Vincennes. Hearing that he had not, he remained silent, walking up and down his library with his hands crossed behind his back, till Réal appeared. After listening to the latter's explanation, he fell again into a reverie; then, without expressing a word either of approval or blame, he remarked, "It is well," and marched off upstairs, leaving Savary and Réal in surprise and doubt.

The night before the trial Bonaparte had written a letter to Réal, telling him to go at once to Vincennes and ask the Duc d'Enghien certain questions, of which the most important were:[4]

"1. Have you borne arms against your country?

"2. Have you been in the pay of England?

"4. Have you not had communication with the English and placed yourself at their disposal . . . . , and have you not so far forgotten your natural feelings as to call the French your most cruel enemy?

---

[1] It is a significant fact that Savary did not show any concern at the consequences of his haste in the matter; he evidently knew that he had done what was expected of him.

[2] Pasquier, I. 195; Rovigo's *Extrait des Mém.*, in *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, p. 35.

[3] Méneval was present and relates what passed. *Memoirs of Napoleon I.* (trans. by Sherard, London, 1894), I. 261–264.

[4] *Corr. de Nap.*, 7639.

"5. Have you not proposed to raise a legion and cause French troops to desert from the Republic, saying that your residence during two years near the frontier had put you in the way of communicating with the French troops on the Rhine?

"9. Were you not cognizant of a plot formed by the English for the overthrow of the government; and had the plot been successful would you not have entered Alsace and even gone to Paris, according to the circumstances?"

It seems probable that Bonaparte meant sincerely what he said in his letter, and intended that Réal should be present at the trial; and that it was owing to an accident that Réal was not there. The letter came to Réal's house about ten o'clock at night; there was still time to reach Vincennes before the trial, if he had hurried. But, tired out with overwork, he had gone to bed early; having been waked up twice already by unimportant messages, he had positively forbidden his servant to disturb him again before morning. When the letter from Bonaparte came, the servant, ignorant of its real importance, laid it on the table by his master's bed. Happening to wake up about four o'clock Réal saw the letter, dressed hastily, and started for Vincennes, but met Savary at the barrier, as mentioned above, when the affair was all over.[1]

But although we admit that Bonaparte was acting sincerely when he wrote to Réal to go to Vincennes, it would be a great mistake to suppose that, in so doing, he intended to pardon the Duc afterwards, or even intended that Réal should in any way delay the sentence and execution so as to leave a chance for clemency open. For, as has been pointed out above, the First Consul's mind was made up from the first that the Duc must die; he felt sure that the court-martial would condemn him,[2] and he never at any time intended to thwart his own work by reversing the sentence of the court-martial and pardoning him;[3] people would laugh at him and say that he was afraid to put a Bourbon to death. No, Réal was not sent to Vincennes to act as a brake on the proceedings, but for the very opposite purpose. He was to show the judge-advocate his business and help him over any questions or difficulties that might arise unexpectedly; and he was to convince the other judges, by his greater knowledge of the affair and his experience in politics, that they must speedily find the accused guilty for the sake of the safety of the state. That this was Bonaparte's intention in sending Réal is further confirmed by the closing words of his letter: "You are to guide the public prosecutor and instruct him of the necessity of expediting the proceedings."[1] Réal's mission was not for the sake of clemency.

---

[1] Méneval, I. 260.

[2] "The First Consul, whose mind was made up, had no doubt that the Duc would be condemned." Méneval, I. 260.

[3] Napoleon himself declared, in answer to Sir G. Cockburn's inquiry whether there was any truth in the report that he had sent an order for the Duc's reprieve, but that it had unfortunately arrived too late: "It certainly was *not* true, for the Duc was condemned for having conspired against France, and I was determined from the first to let the law take its course respecting him, in order if possible to check the frequent conspiracies." *Bonaparte's Voyage to St. Helena, comprising the Diary of Rear-Admiral Cockburn*, p. 122 (Boston, 1833). We are inclined to believe that this diary contains much or all of the "unpublished memoranda" which Mr. G. Barnett Smith says have lately come into his possession and from which he gives three short extracts in the *Nineteenth*

Did Bonaparte recognize afterwards that he had made a false step, and committed an unnecessary wrong? Undoubtedly, yes. When the fact of the Duc's innocence became more clearly established from the examination of his papers, from the other good reports of him that came from Baden after the execution, from the knowledge that Dumouriez had not left England, and from the circumstance that there were no hundreds of émigrés on the right bank of the Rhine, it would be doing injustice to Bonaparte's mental qualities to say that he still thought his own safety or that of the state had demanded such a victim.[2] He must, moreover, have seen that it had hurt him in the estimation of the French people; for the moral sense of the nineteenth century was different from that of the eighteenth, and the same men who a few years before had looked with consenting approval on the events of the Reign of Terror were now alarmed at the possibility of its renewal. They had hoped that in Bonaparte they had found a ruler who would secure internal peace and justice to France, and they feared that they were to be disappointed in this hope. Many of those nearest the First Consul had opposed his course from the outset, and did not hesitate to express their disapproval of the deed.[3] The only remedy was arbitrary prohibition of all discussion and to this Bonaparte had recourse. It

---

Century, January, 1897, p. 142. The statement quoted above from Cockburn's diary is exactly confirmed by the diary of John R. Glover, Secretary to Rear-Admiral Cockburn, published in *Napoleon's Last Voyages* (London, 1895), p. 184.

[1] "Il sera nécessaire que vous conduisiez l'accusateur public, qui doit être le major de la gendarmerie d'élite, et que vous l'instruisiez de la suite rapide à donner à la procédure." *Corr. de Nap.*, 7639.

[2] See Bonaparte to Melzi, March 6, 1804, *Corr. de Nap.*, 7591.

[3] For the gloom and disapproval which the Duc's death caused in France see Chateaubriand, *Mém. d'Outre-tombe*, II. 431–434, Bourrienne, II. 268, 272–279, and Doris, pp. 116–118. It is in striking contrast with the exuberant joy of the people of Paris two weeks before when Georges Cadoudal was captured and prevented from injuring the First Consul.

was clear that he was disappointed in the way in which France received the news; he had intended to produce a result diametrically opposite—to fix the blame of the Duc's death on England and the Bourbons;[1] instead the people of France laid the blame on him.

Outside of France the effect of the Duc's death was still worse. The news sent a shudder through all Europe; the ruler of France, soon to make himself Emperor, was looked upon as little less than a murderer, with whom the other sovereigns could have nothing in common.[2] For the moment, to be sure, the rest of Europe was unable to take any steps to retaliate seriously upon the First Consul. The Czar of Russia showed his strong disapproval by putting his court into mourning and sending a note to the German Diet urging that the same action be taken on account of the recent violation of the territory of Baden. But he had to content himself for the present with breaking off diplomatic relations with France; he could find no one on the continent to join with him in declaring war. Prussia remained neutral and her king silent. Austria withdrew her troops from Suabia in accordance with Talleyrand's demand, and sent a courier to Paris to say that "she could understand certain political necessities." Dynastic politics had therefore, for the moment, rendered the public expression of opinion impossible. But in the autumn Russia and Austria began to draw together against the common enemy. The European cabinets never forgot the reckless neglect of the rights secured by international law, which Bonaparte showed in the case of the Duc d'Enghien; a man who had acted thus would do worse; there could be no peace nor safety for Europe while he ruled in France; he must be continually fought against till expelled. At this disapproval on the part of France and increased hatred from the rest of Europe, Bonaparte was mortified and angry; he saw that he had made a mistake, he had put to death a man who was not guilty, and it had done him harm instead of good; he was expressing his true thoughts when he dictated to Méneval the statement that the death of the Duc d'Enghien "hurt Napoleon in public opinion and politically was of no use to him."[3] It was this same feeling of angry mortification at what he had done that led him to reproach Talleyrand so bitterly in 1809, and later at St. Helena to try to lay the blame of the Duc's death on him and his other overzealous advisers.[1]

---

[1] Bonaparte expressly asserted that "the death of the Duc d'Enghien must be attributed to the Comte d'Artois, who directed and commanded from London the assassination of Napoleon." Méneval, I. 270.

[2] Gustavus Adolphus was only expressing the universal feeling when he sent back to the King of Prussia the Order of the Black Eagle, saying "he could not consent to be the brother-in-arms of the assassin of the Duc d'Enghien." Chateaubriand, *Mém. d'Outre-tombe*, II. 438 *seq.*

[3] Méneval, I. 267.

But at other times his pride and self-possession mastered his real feelings; he would not admit that he had done a wrong which was of no use; he must not let the people of France know that Napoleon Bonaparte had made a false step; so he boldly and frequently declared in public that the Duc was guilty of sharing in the conspiracy against his life; that he had him put to death for his own safety and that of the state. The law of nature, he said to Las Cases, justified him in taking measures for self-defense: "I was assailed on all sides by enemies whom the Bourbons had raised up against me. Threatened with air-guns, infernal machines, and treacherous plots of all kinds, I seized the occasion to strike terror even as far as London."[2] And, finally, on his death-bed at St. Helena, when a maladroit attendant read from an English review a scathing account of the Duc's murder, the dying man's pride and obstinate persistency in trying to make the deed seem less odious by declaring that it was a measure necessary to the safety of the state, gave him strength to rise from his bed, catch up his will, and insert, in a narrow space between the lines, a defiant justification which should stand forever before the world as his last word on the subject: "I had the Duc d'Enghien arrested and tried, because it was necessary to do so for the safety, the interests, and the honor of the French people, at a time when the Comte d'Artois openly admitted that he had sixty paid assassins in Paris. In like circumstances, I should do so again."[3]

In spite of these declarations, dictated by a feeling of pride and unwillingness to admit a mistake, there can be no doubt that the execution of the Duc d'Enghien was one of Bonaparte's greatest political mistakes and was one of many causes that led subsequently to his downfall.[4] There is much truth in the remark that Fouché is reported to have made on this sad affair,—"It was worse than a crime; it was a blunder."

Sidney B. Fay.

---

[1] Las Cases, VII. 310–337; see also in Pasquier, I. 211, an anecdote which shows the anger that was aroused in Napoleon when reminded of this blot on his character.

[2] Cf. also his statement to Admiral Cockburn, *supra*.

[3] *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, 299.

[4] Méneval (III. 474), who puts things in the most favorable light for Napoleon, in summing up the half-dozen most important causes of his overthrow, names first, the hatred of the European dynasties for the new régime in France; second, England's command of the sea; and third, "the condemnation of the Duc d'Enghien, a painful event, a fatal episode in Napoléon's reign, of which the enemies of our country, in their bad faith and animosity, did not fail to take advantage in their campaigns against France and her chief."

THE OUTCOME OF THE CABOT QUATER-CENTENARY

It cannot be said that the four-hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the American continent by John Cabot was celebrated with as much enthusiasm as that of the West Indies by Columbus. A good test is the number of historical and literary productions published on those two occasions. For the achievement of the great Genoese, we know of six hundred and fifty books and pamphlets printed in 1891 and 1892, in nearly all the languages of Europe, in prose and verse. Concerning Cabot's discovery, we have heard of only two or three volumes, a dozen review and newspaper articles, three memoirs, an address, four speeches, two medleys of barefaced plagiarism, the one fabricated in Bristol, the other, quite recently, in London, and no poem at all. The indifference of the public, at home and abroad, was further shown by the utter failure of the subscription which Americans residing in England started for the purpose of arranging a plan whereby adequate notice might be taken of the event in Bristol. Yet John Cabot is certainly more to the people of England and of the United States than Christopher Columbus is in many respects, although he cannot be justly credited with greater forecast in the accomplishment of his famous deed.

Scanty as those publications may be, they nevertheless afford a certain interest. Three or four of them are curious on different accounts. One shows original investigations, and although based upon positive errors, with conclusions quite as erroneous, it does credit to its author. Another exhibits honest recantations, indicating that conscientious historians now generally adopt notions concerning the Cabots, particularly Sebastian, which a few years ago were almost hooted at. A third and fourth afford fair samples of the historical erudition of distinguished orators, lay and clerical. We only propose to examine the questions alleged to have been solved in all these Cabotian effusions, and especially the intrinsic worth of the statements brought forward to bolster delusions regarding the memorable transatlantic voyage of 1497.

I.

We first notice a paper of Dr. Samuel Edward Dawson inserted in the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada.*[1] It is called in that country "an admirable monograph, incomparably the best thing ever written on the subject, and to the author of which we must all doff our caps." That paper is also represented, in certain academic quarters, "to have settled the long-disputed question of Cabot's landfall."[2]

The problem has been mooted by Dr. Dawson, we confess, with skill and an adequate knowledge of the subject. To us, personally, it is a positive relief to see at last a critic who answers facts, arguments and documents, not with shallow and puerile reasons, betraying an incredible ignorance of the matter, as is so often the case, but by resorting to objections which deserve to be seriously discussed, however erroneous they may prove to be in important particulars.

Dr. Dawson is convinced that the landfall of John Cabot in 1497 is the easternmost point of Cape Breton; and he has endeavored to prove it by a theory of his own concerning the magnetic variations, at first as follows:

"If Columbus *on a direct western course dropped two hundred and forty miles from Gomera* his point of departure to his landfall in the Antilles in 1492 with a variation of one point west, it is altogether probable that John Cabot with a variation of a point and a half would have dropped, in 1497, three hundred and sixty miles to the south on his *western course across the Atlantic;* and, again, if John Cabot laid his course to the west by compass from latitude 53° north the variation, so much greater than that observed by Columbus, would have carried him clear of Cape Race and to the next probable landfall, Cape Breton."[3]

If language means anything, it is plain that, according to the above extract, Dr. Dawson's premises were Columbus's course from Gomera and Cabot's course from latitude 53° north. It likewise sets forth as the basis for measuring the length of the line of divergence the length of the course from Gomera to Guanahani. For what can be clearer than the phrase which we underscore? Nor is the wording corrected or contradicted anywhere in Dr. Dawson's memoir.

At the outset it must be said that even admitting, for the sake of argument, Dr. Dawson's hypothesis that John Cabot experienced a magnetic variation of a point and a half, he nevertheless would not have dropped three hundred and sixty miles, as Dr. Dawson has said and believed. It has been demonstrated[1] by $a + b$ that Cabot would have dropped one hundred and eighty-three miles only. And, consequently, (always as a logical inference from Dr. Dawson's theory, such as we find it explicitly stated in the said memoir), instead of making his landfall at Cape Breton, as our learned opponent asserts or asserted, Cabot would have made it just *one hundred and seventy-seven miles more to the northward;* that is to say, in Newfoundland, on the eastern shore of Cape Bauld.

---

[1] Vol. XII., Sec. II., 1894, and Vol. II., Sec. II., 1896.

[2] Dr. Harvey's remarks in *op. cit*, 1896, Vol. II., Sec. II., p. 3.

[3] *Op. cit.*, 1894, p. 58.

So much for "incomparably the best thing ever written on the subject," and "the settlement of the long-disputed question of Cabot's landfall at Cape Breton," as Canadian savants declare.

That was four years ago. Dr. Dawson now holds and claims to have meant that in measuring the length of the line of divergence south of a due western course, "we must commence in the case of Cabot near the coast of Ireland, and in the case of Columbus at a considerable distance west of Gomera."[2] That is a new proposition altogether, and absolutely adverse to the very precise expressions employed by him in 1894. Under the circumstances, it is surprising that Dr. Dawson, as the expert writer that he is, should have written so clearly "If Columbus on a direct western course dropped 240 miles *from Gomera*," instead of writing as he does at this late hour, and again erroneously as we propose to show: "Columbus dropped 240 miles from the place where the westing of his compass reached one point," or "in 40° longitude," or "at a considerable distance west of Gomera."

Be that as it may, Dr. Dawson's new position is just as untenable as the first. It again rests upon an aggregation of bare hypotheses.[3] He gratuitously assumes that the laws of secular motion of the curves of equal variation on the surface of the globe are sufficiently known to enable him to infer from the variations which Columbus experienced in 25° north latitude, the variations which Cabot experienced in 53° north latitude. He also takes for granted

---

[1] For a mathematical demonstration of the fallacy, see the *Nachrichten von der königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Philolog.-histor. Klasse, 1897, Heft 3, pp. 345–348.

[2] *The Voyages of the Cabots.* Roy. Soc. Can., Vol. III., Sec. II., 1897, p. 161.

[3] "In a brief interview I had with Mr. Fox, I took occasion to express my conviction of the impossibility of arriving at any very definite conclusion, partly on account of the extremely scanty material as to facts and partly in consequence of the want of assistance derivable from purely theoretical grounds; the cause of the phenomenon of the secular change of the magnetic declination being quite unknown and the time comparatively short during which to trace the law of change as hitherto observed." Charles A. Schott, *An Inquiry into the Variation of the Compass*, Coast Survey Reports for 1880.

(theoretically) that the variations experienced by Cabot cannot possibly have been inferior or superior to one point and a half west, or eastwardly, or *nil*; which assumption, whether expressed or implied, is entirely unwarranted.

The learned Canadian likewise argues as if we were as well posted regarding the particulars of Cabot's voyage as we are concerning that of Columbus. He forgets that we know nothing whatever about Cabot's course, beyond the naked fact that he sailed west from some undetermined point on the western coast of Ireland and "wandered a good deal:—*havendo assai errato.*" How can a reflective and investigating mind build upon such vague data, were it partly only, the asseveration that Cabot's course was west magnetic, and that the corresponding true course was this magnetic course west, corrected by one point and a half of variation?

As a sort of apology, Dr. Dawson at present informs his readers that the "increment of variation was not intended to be, and could not be, an argument in the least degree amenable to mathematical treatment." Why then did he take it as the basis of his postulate, when stating that John Cabot "with a variation of one point and a half would have dropped 360 miles to the south," or that if the bold navigator "laid his course to the west by compass from latitude 53° N., a variation of one point and a half would have carried him clear of Cape Race?" Was not this alleged consequence predicated upon mathematical treatment?

Driven away from this position, Dr. Dawson appeals to "the uniformity of the laws of nature, by which we are led to assume that in whatever way the magnetic pole and curves of variation are shifting now they were shifting then, in that slow change which is still going on from year to year."

Dr. Dawson confuses two very distinct things, viz.: the uniformity of the laws of nature, by virtue of which occur around us the movements which we observe, and the uniformity of these movements. Because a movement is produced by the uniform laws of nature, it does not follow that this movement must necessarily be uniform. In nature, on the contrary, movements are exceedingly varied; as is shown constantly in astronomy, natural philosophy, and all the sciences in which movements are studied.

It is therefore inexact and unscientific, from beginning to end, to maintain that the magnetic variation at Cape Race in 1497 can be determined from the fact that "it is at present 30° west, and that the variation now at the Admiral's point of observation in 1492, is 20° west." The relative positions of the curves of equal variation between the coast of Ireland and Newfoundland at the time of

Cabot are totally unknown,[1] and cannot be therefore deduced from their actual position. We have only to examine on an Admiralty chart the present distribution of those curves, to see at a glance that if mentally or otherwise we move the network or entire series of them (supposing, for the experiment, that they are rigid or material) the magnetic curves which pass over any portion of the globe *will no longer bear to each other the relations which they had before we displaced the entire set of said curves*, in the manner aforesaid. Dr. Dawson therefore has not proved and cannot prove by what he calls the uniformity of the laws of nature that "Cabot in a northern parallel would, of necessity, cross the magnetic meridians in quicker succession," and still less that the total result of variation experienced by Cabot between Ireland and Newfoundland was "a point and a half."

We must now revert to Dr. Dawson's new specific theory. He says that "from the sum total of 3150 miles [given by his opponent as the length of Columbus's course from Gomera to Guanahani] must be deducted at least 672 miles, leaving a distance of 2478 miles,[2] because [as Dr. Dawson again alleges] it was not until he reached the longitude of 40° that the Admiral noticed a variation of a full point." He completes his postulate with the further assertion that "the length of the course should be counted, for the purpose of this argument, from the point where the disturbing influence first began to act."

But where did it first begin to act? That is the question. All we know on the subject is comprised within these few words of Columbus in his log-book: "Jueves, 13 de Setiembre. En este dia, al comienzo de la noche, las agujas noruesteaban, y á la mañana noruesteaban algun tanto." The Admiral does not state, and we have no means whatever of knowing, in what meridian the westing of his compasses was thus noticed.

---

[1] Dr. Dawson in support of his theory refers to Reinel's chart of 1505 (monograph of 1898, p. 161) which, he says, "shows plainly upon it, by its double scale, a variation on the Newfoundland coast of nearly two points." That will be news to the student of cartography. It is true that in one of the scales Cape Race has the latitude of 50½° N., and in the other it has the latitude of 47° N., which is nearer the truth. But neither the one nor the other has anything to do with the magnetic variation. The oblique scale is merely a graphic *correction* of an original error in the perpendicular one. Kohl (*Doc. Hist. of Maine*, p. 178) and Peschel (*Zeitalt. der Entdeck.*, 1858, p. 332, note 2), both of them high authorities, who describe the scale on the chart, would not have failed to notice the fact if they had ever dreamt that magnetism was at all involved in the matter. Supposing even that one or the other of these scales was intended to show a variation (which hypothesis is scarcely admissible) and that the variation was exact, it would apply only to the east coast of Newfoundland, and not to the marine space between Ireland and Newfoundland; the totality of which has to be taken into account in a computation of that sort.

[2] By Columbus's course, as worked out by Capt. Fox, the distance was 3105 miles; but this difference of 45 miles is insignificant.

According to the recent map produced by Dr. Dawson himself, the agonic line was met by Columbus in the meridian of about 30°. The fact that he noticed the westing of his compasses on the 13th of September[1] does not prove that his course until then had been constantly due west from Gomera to the meridian of 40° longitude, adopted by Dr. Dawson, and especially between 30° and 40°. This he is bound to show before assuming to deduct 672 miles from the course. Further, what we know of the matter has no other basis than Capt. Schott's above-mentioned conjectural chart, and, curious to say, it even contradicts Dr. Dawson's theory in a most important particular.

We see, for instance, from this hypothetical tracing of the line of no variation that the westing of Columbus's compasses commenced near 30° west, and went on increasing until 40°, when the Admiral noticed that the variation had reached one full point west. From 40° W., in a western course, it could but continue to increase and was more than one point until the landfall was made at Guanahani. It follows that if, according to Dr. Dawson's new theory, "the length of the course should be counted from the point where the disturbing influence first began to act," we must count, not from 40°, as Dr. Dawson now maintains, but from a meridian situated nine or ten degrees more to the eastwards, viz.: *in the longitude of 30°* (in round figures).

Even with the minimum length (2433 miles) assumed by him for the portion of the course which alone, he now says, experienced the variation west, we find for a linear deviation of 240 miles, an angular deviation of 5° 38′.[2] It follows that if with a variation of one point west (11° 15′) Columbus's angular deviation was 5° 38′, Cabot's angular deviation, with Dr. Dawson's alleged variation of one point and a half (16° 52′ 30″), will be one-and-a-half times 5° 38′, or 8° 27′.

And now, what is the practical outcome of all these technical demonstrations?

---

[1] It is well to recollect that we do not possess the original complete text of Columbus's log-book. We only have an abridgment made by Bishop Las Casas, and even this was made from a mere copy, now lost.

[2] We know that Dr. Dawson does not like logarithms and mathematical proofs, but they cannot well be avoided at this present juncture.

Calling x the angle of deviation of the course of Columbus from the true direction east and west, this angle x is given by the relation $\tan x = \frac{240}{2433}$.

$$\begin{array}{rl} \text{Log} \quad 240 & = 2.380211 \\ \text{Colog} \; 2433 & = \bar{4}.613858 \\ \hline \text{Log} \; \tan x & = \bar{2}.994069 \\ x & = 5^\circ \; 38' \end{array}$$

This angular deviation of 8° 27′ corresponds with a linear deviation of 233 miles south of the parallel of 53° latitude north, in which Cabot's magnetic course is supposed to have lain. Theoretically, this magnetic course amounted exactly to 1621 miles, Dr. Dawson to the contrary notwithstanding.[1] He says 1740 miles. But 1740 miles is the distance from the Irish coast in 53° latitude north to Cape Race, and the learned Canadian is simply begging the question when he sets forth *a priori* this distance of 1740 miles before having first proved that Cabot actually passed close to Cape Race; which is the gist of the problem.

Admitting therefore (still for the sake of argument) a variation of one point and a half (16° 52′ 30″) west for Cabot, we find that the angular deviation in his course was only 8° 27′, which, as above stated, corresponds with a linear deviation of 238 miles,[2] instead of 360 miles alleged by our painstaking opponent. These 238 miles of linear deviation would fix Cabot's landfall at 360—238=122 *miles more to the northwards* than the landfall which Dr. Dawson strenuously advocates; as he can readily ascertain by borrowing "the chart, the ruler and the protractor" of a highly impartial and considerate Toronto critic, but making a more judicious use of the same.

In other words, the landfall of Cabot, which, according to Dr. Dawson's interpretation of 1896, was at Cape Breton, would have been (under his first theory) far up in Newfoundland, at White Bay. The landfall which, according to his interpretation of 1898, was also at Cape Breton, would have been (under his latest theory) in a very different place, viz.: in the Bay of Bonavista.

Withal, we do not wish to be understood to say that the landfall was at Bonavista rather than at Cape Breton, or anywhere else. Our sole object has been to prove that on this point Dr. Dawson erred as much in 1898 as he did in 1894 and 1896. As to our private opinion, it is that we do not know and apparently never shall know where John Cabot first sighted the New World.

II.

So recently as 1893, Sir Clements Markham, the distinguished

---

[1] The magnetic course is the only one that should be taken into account in the computation of the linear deviation in Cabot's real course, as being *the only length known*, in concurrence with the tangent of the angle of deviation; and no mathematician will gainsay this.

[2] Calling x Cabot's linear deviation, the deviation is given by the relation

$$x = 1600 \times \tan 8^\circ 27'.$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Log} \tan 8^\circ 27' &= \bar{1}.71899 \\ \text{Log } 1600 &= \underline{3.204120} \\ \text{Log } x &= 2.376019 \\ x &= 237 \text{ miles } 7. \end{aligned}$$

President of the Royal Geographical Society, maintained as regards Cabot's landfall the following opinion :[1]

"The great value of the 1544 map of Sebastian Cabot is that it fixes the landfall of his father's first voyage; that *on this point he is the highest authority, and that his evidence is quite conclusive,* if it was given in good faith" (p. xxxiii.).

Sir Clements reached the climax as follows:

"As Sebastian Cabot had no motive for falsifying his map he did not do so, and the 'Prima Vista' [*i. e.,* Cape Breton] where he placed it, *is the true landfall of John Cabot on his first voyage*" (p. xxxiv.).

In reply, among other cogent reasons, it was urged that Sebastian did have motives for falsifying his map; that is, in placing in 1544 the landfall at Cape Breton, after having constantly, for thirty years previous, caused it to be inscribed in Labrador. These motives were that the explorations of Jacques Cartier had brought to notice a valuable region which France, then at war with England, was attempting to colonize; that Sebastian Cabot, to advance his own interest, was always engaged in plotting and corresponding in secret with foreign rulers; that so early as 1538, he was intriguing with the English ambassador in Spain to be employed by Henry VIII.; that his cartographical statements, as embodied in the 1544 map, may well have been a suggestion of British claims and a bid for the King of England's favor, considering that to place the landfall near the gulf of St. Lawrence was tantamount to declaring Cape Breton and Newfoundland (instead of bleak and worthless Labrador) to be English territory; and that in fact, a couple of years afterwards, he removed to England, where His Majesty pensioned and employed him. These reasons, which we innocently believed to be worth listening to, were unceremoniously dismissed by Sir Clements Markham as being "quite inadequate," and without his taking the trouble, as, under the circumstances, he should have done, to explain the cartographical change brought about by Sebastian Cabot. In consequence, the positive belief of Sir Clements that Cape Breton Island was Cabot's landfall remained, for the time being, unshaken.

The eminent geographer also maintained the following assertion:

"Cabot after a voyage of fifty days reached land at five o'clock in the morning of *Saturday, the 24th of June,* being St. John's Day" (p. xv.).

---

[1] *The Journal of Christopher Columbus,* Hakluyt Society Public. No. LXXXVI., 1893.

As regards the participation of Sebastian Cabot in that memorable expedition, which had been the object of grave doubts, Sir Clements expressed this opinion:

"On the whole it seems *most probable* that John Cabot did take his young son [*i. e.*, Sebastian] with him" (p. xxiv.).

We are now made to witness a sudden revolution of opinions on these important points of maritime history.

In a paper read at the Royal Geographical Society, April 12, 1897,[1] Sir Clements Markham frankly acknowledges that "some of his views [on the subject of the Cabots] have been modified."

This time (employing the same argument which had been advanced five years ago to batter down his advocacy of the landfall at Cape Breton, viz.: the brief account which John Cabot himself gave to Raimondo di Soncino of his voyage), Sir Clements Markham throws overboard both the Cabotian planisphere and the *Prima Vista* at that very Cape Breton. It should also be noticed that with Dr. Dawson's chief argument for proving that Cape Breton was the real landfall, Sir Clements reaches an entirely different conclusion:

"The same amount of southing," says he, "caused by the variation of the compass which took Columbus to Guanahani would have taken Cabot to Bonavista bay, and taking Soncino's account of the voyage by itself, *there can be no question that Bonavista bay*, on the east coast of Newfoundland, *was the landfall*" (p. 608).

Unfortunately, Sir Clements neglects to initiate us into the arcana of his computations. It would have proved interesting to subject them to the same *experimentum crucis* as Dr. Dawson's. Meanwhile the change of front from Cape Breton to Bonavista is already a point gained. Further on it will be shown what we are to think of this new landfall.

As to the date, Sir Clements is no longer so positive: "*It was not necessarily* on June 24th," he now says (p. 610). With regard to his previous opinion that "*most probably*" Sebastian Cabot joined the expedition of 1497, Sir Clements at present rejects it altogether. "*Sebastian*," says he, "*was not himself on board the Matthew*;" adding even: "*and it is very doubtful whether he accompanied his father on either of his voyages*" (p. 612).

These departures from opinions formerly held and energetically defended by the eminent geographer deserve to be noted, particularly in connection with a recantation of the same kind which stands to the credit of Dr. Dawson. For instance, this savant has found fault with one of Cabot's biographers who, he says (most erroneously however) after fixing the landfall at Cape Breton, wrote ten years afterwards in favor of the coast of Labrador. Yet, himself, after believing the landfall to have been in Newfoundland,[1] he now places it at Cape Breton.

---

[1] *The Geographical Journal*, London, June, 1897.

So far from blaming such changes of view, in this or any other historical investigation, on the part of Dr. Dawson, or on the part of Sir Clements Markham, we consider that they bespeak the true spirit of experienced and loyal historians. He is indeed a very poor student of history who imagines that the book he writes embodies the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, for all times to come. Even if every source of information had been exhausted, there would still remain the parallel evolution of kindred sciences and the faculty to appreciate, which, it is almost a truism to say, becomes keener and keener through constant exercise and a more thorough knowledge of the facts. "L' Histoire est une enquête perpétuelle." Only the wiseacres whose method and profound learning consist exclusively in collecting, as with a spoon, so to speak, the footnotes and statements of others, think otherwise.

III.

Dr. Dawson, after publishing his interesting monograph of 1894, wrote another,[2] not less elaborate, which may be called an attempt at elucidating the first, and wherein new Cabotian theories are advanced. One of these concerns the fact that after causing during thirty years the landfall to be marked in Labrador or Greenland, Sebastian Cabot removed it to Cape Breton. The question involves, besides, a point of capital interest concerning the cartographical history of America. Dr. Dawson disposes of it as follows:

"Sebastian Cabot was not in truth English born, and had no patriotic obligation to guard English interests. Therefore, when he was made grand pilot of Spain, and head of the department of cartography at Seville, he quietly acquiesced in the suppression on the maps he supervised of all traces of his father's voyage and his father's discoveries for England. . . Cabot was well recompensed by the King of Spain for the use of that knowledge of the Baccalaos, which he above others possessed; and that knowledge, underrated and even despised in England, was suppressed upon the Spanish and Portuguese maps. That is the answer to the question: Why, if Cabot's landfall had been really at Cape Breton in Baccalaos, did he not record it upon the maps he supervised while grand pilot of Spain?" (monograph of 1894, p. 84).

---

[1] "For many years, under the influence of current traditions and cursory reading, I believed the landfall of John Cabot to have been in Newfoundland." Dr. Dawson in *Trans. Royal Soc. Can.* for 1894, p. 55.

[2] *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Canada relative to a Cabot celebration in 1896*, Vol. II., Sec. II.; and *The Voyages of the Cabots; Latest Phases of the Controversy*, N. S., Vol. III., Sec. II., 1897.

This alleged suppression of maps is a pure invention. The English discoveries were so little suppressed in the Spanish maps, that all we know about them cartographically is to be found exclusively in Spanish maps of the time and in contemporaneous copies of them. First, before Cabot came to Spain, in La Cosa's planisphere (1500), which delineates the "*Mar descubierta por inglese.*" Then, while Sebastian Cabot held the office of pilot major of Spain, in the mappemonde sent from Seville by Robert Thorne (1527), where we read: "*Terra hec ab Anglis primum fuit inventa.*" Afterwards, in the Weimar Ribeiro (1529), bearing the inscription: "*Esta tierra descubrieron los Ingleses,*" and in the Propaganda map (1529), which inserts the legend: "*laqual descubrieron los Ingleses de la villa de Bristol,*" a statement also inscribed in the Wolfenbüttel mappemonde (*circa* 1530), all of which are maps openly made in Seville, most of them while Charles V. sat upon the throne and by his own chart-makers.

If Dr. Dawson's theory is sound, let him say why the Spanish royal cartographers should have inscribed the English discoveries in official charts at all? On the other hand, at that time, or at any time, what difference could it make to Spain to place the English discoveries in Greenland or in Labrador rather than at Cape Breton, if the latter was the true place? Neither the one nor the other belonged to her. Ever since 1494 those three countries had been relinquished by Spain in favor of Portugal, officially and forever. We still possess two original maps[1] based upon the Royal Pattern (*Padron real*) and endorsed by cosmographers of Charles V. The one, dated 1527, states that it contains all that which was discovered up to date: "*todo lo que del Mundo se a descubierto fasta aora.*" The other, dated 1529, adds to this statement the following words: "according to the treaty which was entered into by the Catholic Sovereigns of Spain and King John of Portugal at Tordesillas in 1494: "*conforme a la capitulacion que hizieron los Çatholicos Reyes de España y el Rey don Juan de Portugal en Tordesillas año de 1494,*" and both are signed by a "*Cosmographo de Su Magestad.*"

These authentic maps trace the line of demarcation between Spain and Portugal, marking with a Spanish flag the region within which westwardly the one could accomplish maritime discoveries, and with a Portuguese standard the region allotted eastwardly to the other for the same purpose.[2] Now, that line in those, and in fact in all the Spanish maps of the sixteenth century, is made to pass through the longitude of Halifax, ascribing therefore the greatest part of Nova Scotia, the whole of Cape Breton Island and of Newfoundland, as well as the east coast of Labrador, to Portugal exclusively.

---

[1] Kohl, *Die beiden ältesten General-Karten von Amerika*, Weimar, 1860, folio.

[2] *Alleged Partition of the Globe*, in *The Diplomatic History of America, its first chapter, 1452–1493–1494*, London, 1897, pp. 74–77.

It is plain to any unbiassed mind that under the circumstances Spain had no interest whatever in making a mystery of the geographical configuration of the Atlantic borders north of the Carolinas; particularly as the Tierra de Ayllon, in about 35° latitude, was the extreme limit of what she claimed as her own, or attempted to colonize in that region.

Nor were the discoveries accomplished by the English a secret for any one. If the country discovered by them was Cape Breton, how is it that all the old maps and mappemondes name that region, not *Tierra de los Ingleses*, but *Tierra de los Bretones*, and even, in unmistakable language, *Terra que foy descubierta por bertomes?* Why should the Portuguese, the Catalans, the Italians, etc., who certainly had no reasons whatever for preferring the Bretons to the English, ascribe to Brittany a merit alleged to belong to England?

This legend is so deeply rooted that we must be permitted to expatiate upon its improbability. It is difficult to conceive anything more inconsistent with the records of Spanish maritime history than the assertion that Spain ever possessed geographical data concerning North America, of which other nations knew nothing, and which it was a crime to disclose in maps. In those days, the Castilian kings (to whom alone the Indies belonged, Aragon having no share in them) made known all their public orders not verbally, but by written ordinances (*cédulas*) duly promulgated. And it must be said that no monarchs in Europe indulged in the practice more than they did. We still possess all the prohibitions of a public character and decrees enacted by them. If there had even existed under their reign a law making it unlawful to communicate maps of the newly-discovered regions, we should certainly find it in one at least of the numerous *Recopilaciones de Leyes*, particularly among their elaborate and minute clauses relative to nautical matters.[1] Now there is not a single one containing the least trace of anything of the kind.[2] Nor did any searcher ever find in the records of the Casa de Contratacion a single case of pilots or seamen, or merchants, or underwriters, or cartographers having been molested on that account.[1]

---

[1] Besides the *Recopilaciones*, see Veytia Linage, *Norte de la Contratacion*, Seville, 1672, folio.

[2] Dr. Dawson says: "In 1511 an edict was issued forbidding the communication of charts to foreigners" (monograph of 1894, p. 68). This edict exists only in the learned Canadian's imagination.

On the contrary, a number of examples could be cited to prove how great was the immunity regarding the communication of maps, even to foreigners. For instance, the greatest events in the naval history of Spain are the discoveries of Columbus and Magellan. Isabella and Charles V. well knew that Venice beheld those new seaways as bespeaking the downfall of her commercial influence in the far East. Still, when Angelo Trivigiano asked of Columbus, for the use of the celebrated Venetian Admiral Domenico Malipiero, a map of the newly-discovered regions, the great Genoese at once sent his own copy to Palos, to have a perfect and complete reproduction made by a pilot of the place: "fata et copiosa, et particular di quanto paese é stato scoperto."[2] As to the all-important strait discovered by Magellan, it was openly disclosed and delineated, with the exact route, in maps and globes supplied by Maximilianus Transylvanus, the secretary of Charles V.[3] Yet, *a priori*, what required more to be kept secret than the way to the Spice Islands?

Furthermore, the advocates of the theory that geographical data were withheld by Spain, should first show in what respects any of the numerous Spanish maps of the time which we possess, and which set forth North American configurations, omit anything of importance that was then known. Peter Martyr, Las Casas, Oviedo, the mass of letters patent and judicial inquests concerning the transatlantic discoveries, etc., etc., state in detail the objects and results of Spanish voyages to the Indies, as America was then called. Not a single topographical datum worth recording can be pointed out as having been omitted in any of the semi-official Sevillan maps which have reached us. Nor is there one which does not contain all that the Casa de Contratacion, with its means of information, could then know. This fact will not be gainsaid by any one at all familiar with the Spanish archives and cartography. And as regards the northeast coast, if those charts servilely set forth the delineations, and even the very nomenclature of the Portuguese portulans, throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it is because Spain possessed no other source of information, and, consequently, she had nothing whatever to conceal in that respect.[1]

---

[1] As to the argument of Dr. Dawson upon a passage from a letter sent from Seville in 1527 by Robert Thorne with a map to Dr. Lee, see the *Discovery of North America by John Cabot*, 3d edit., pp. 20, 21.

[2] Letter "Ex Granata die 21 Aug. 1501," in *Christophe Colomb*, Vol. II., p. 119. The original MS. of those highly interesting letters was discovered only five years ago in the library of Mr. Sneyd at Newcastle.

[3] *De Moluccis insulis*, Coloniae, 1523, and Epistle addressed by Schöner to Reymer von Streytpergk, in Wieser's *Magalhães-Strasse*, Innsbruck, 1881.

In keeping with all those legends, is the following statement of Dr. Dawson: "One fact stares us in the face at the outset, that while maps were freely engraved and printed in all parts of Italy, Germany and France, none were printed in Spain" (monograph of 1898, p. 187).

To interpret this fact as showing "how effectually the Council of the Indies had concealed the cartographical records of their office," Dr. Dawson should commence by proving that the absence of American maps of Spanish make was an exception and that the Spaniards engraved and printed maps of Spain or of other countries at that time. This has not yet been shown by anybody. The plain reason is that no maps of America, and in fact no maps at all, were engraved or printed in Spain before the second half of the sixteenth century;[2] simply because at that time the art of engraving maps, particularly on copper, did not yet exist in that country, as was also the case in England and Portugal.

IV.

Now comes the question of Sebastian Cabot's character as a cosmographer, a scientist, a navigator and a man, which, it must be said, is at present somewhat damaged. Dr. Dawson meets a mass of documentary proofs, absolutely authentic, with an argument which he doubtless believes to be decisive, viz.:

"Ferdinand and Charles V. were good judges of men, and they trusted Sebastian Cabot to the last" (monograph of 1898, p. 182).

Even if it were so (for the word "trusted" is not generally synonymous with "employed"), what of it? History teems with instances of famous kings and great emperors, all "good judges of men," who were, nevertheless, imposed upon by charlatans to the last. How many crowned heads and important personages, as well as lesser ones, do we not see at all times and everywhere deluded by the fallacious promise held out to them of converting the baser metals into pure gold? For Ferdinand and Charles V., for Henry VII. and the advisers of Edward VI., even for Queen Mary,[3] the philosopher's stone was the discovery of a North-West Passage to Cathay; and it was by making those monarchs believe that he positively knew of the existence of such a passage, first in the Baccalaos region (1512), then at the south (1525), and finally towards the North Pole (1553), that Sebastian Cabot prospered both in Spain and in England, after having vainly endeavored to deceive the Republic of Venice (1523 and 1551) by the same pretence.

---

[1] See Oviedo, *Historia General de las Indias*, Vol. II., p. 148. He was state chronicler of the Indies and wrote on the subject of American cartography, shortly after 1541.

[2] The only map of Spanish make known to have been engraved in Spain before 1545, is a rough and small wood-cut inserted in the second or third issue of the 1511 edition of Peter Martyr's *First Decade*. Even the map in Medina's *Arte de Navegar* (1545) is only a rough and badly executed wood-cut, scarcely any better than Peter Martyr's.

[3] Richard Willes, speaking of Sebastian Cabot's map which the Earl of Bedford had at Chenies, says: "In his card drawn with his own hand, the mouth of the North-

"This man," again says Dr. Dawson (ironically), "served some of the most capable princes who ever sat upon a throne, and it remained after 350 years for us to find him out" (monograph of 1897, p. 184).

Just as if there was a time of prescription for mistakes and delusions, or as if the real estimate of Sebastian Cabot's character, under every aspect, was not based altogether upon authentic documents! To a blind admiration, which has no other source than stereotyped averments of suspicious origin and constantly repeated, without control and without proofs, critical historians oppose Sebastian Cabot's own writings and theories. These are amply sufficient to form a correct opinion of his professional and scientific worth. They have been recently examined—for the first time in three centuries—with care and impartiality. Let the champions and admirers *quand même* of Sebastian Cabot come forward and refute, not with legends, with empty words or with objurgations, but by dint of facts and figures, if they can, the opinion formed by painstaking critics of the wily Venetian's value as a commander and a seaman,[1] as a pretended discoverer in magnetics,[2] as an expert in nautical science,[3] nay as a cosmographer.[4] Let them endeavor, if it be within their reach, to trace back to him the least invention or progress in maritime devices or applications; let them even show any act or effort on his part which ever proved beneficial to anything or to any one beside himself.

As to his private character, it is worse still.[5] We will not

---

Western Strait lieth near the 318 meridian, between 61° and 64° in elevation, continuing the same breadth about ten degrees West, where it openeth Southerly more and more." *History of Travayle*, 1577, f°. 232. According to Sir Humphrey Gilbert, Sebastian even boasted having "entered the same fret until he came to the septentrional latitude of 67½ degrees."

[1] Documents in *John Cabot, the Discoverer of North America*, pp. 227–255, 412–427; and Drapeyron's *Revue de Géographie*, Nov., 1897.

[2] Docs. in *John Cabot*, etc., pp. 290–295, 296–308.

[3] Docs. in *op. cit.*, pp. 309–317, 454–456.

[4] Docs. in *op. cit.*, pp. 281–288, and Drapeyron's *Revue*, 1897.

[5] Every document which we now discover continues to tell against Sebastian Cabot's honesty in some way or other. As a professional cartographer, see how he acted toward the Fuggers. We read the following entry in their books, lately brought to light: "Sebastian Gabato, a cosmographer. Loss suffered on his account. He was to make a map-

again enlarge on this topic, further than by expressing our surprise at the sort of ethics now employed to whitewash Sebastian Cabot. To cite a single example.

In 1522, when Magellan's companions had returned to Spain and brought news of the discovery of the southern strait, all the technical details of which had been communicated to Sebastian Cabot by virtue of his office as pilot major, he concocted a plan, which, had it been realizable, would have set at naught the results of that great deed and proved extremely prejudicial to Spain. He called repeatedly on the Venetian ambassador, proposing to carry into effect schemes concerning the spice trade for the Signory's benefit; and finally sent an agent secretly to Venice to proffer his services. Contarini, the ambassador at Valladolid, was at once instructed to confer with Cabot. The official despatch relating the interview is extremely dramatic and exhibits in a vivid light the character of the man.

They met at night. The information that the Signory hearkened to his treacherous proposals elated him. Suddenly, he became alarmed, turned pale and, quaking with fear,[1] besought the ambassador never to divulge the matter, as otherwise "it would cost him his life." The fact is that if Charles V. had been informed of such a plot, the disloyal pilot major would soon have found his way to the gallows.

Cabot, to enhance the reward which he expected to receive from Venice, took pains to inform Contarini that Ferdinand had made him a captain with a salary of 50,000 maravedis, had subsequently given him the office of pilot major with an additional salary of 50,000 maravedis and 25,000 besides as a gratuity. Then, to show, in his own peculiar way, his gratitude to Spain, he proposed to lead a Venetian fleet to Cathay or to the Spice Islands through a passage which he pretended to have discovered: "come e il vero che io l'ho ritrovato." Is it not plain that if such a knowledge existed, its disclosure belonged, as of right, to the government which employed and paid him and should never have been imparted by the pilot major of Spain to a rival nation? Every impartial his-

---

pemonde for us. He never did, and notwithstanding repeated efforts we have been unable to recover the money we had paid him for it, viz.: 2250 maravedis." "1553. He left Spain to go to England, and we do not know whether he is still alive. Loss for George Stecher, 2250 mrs." Konrad Haebler, *Zeitschrift der Gesellsch. f. Erdkunde zu Berlin*, Bd. XXX., 1895.

[1] "Li detti la lettera, lui la lesse et legiendola si mosse tutto di colore. Da poij letta, stete cussi un pocheto senza dirmi altro quasi sbigotito et dubio . . . ma vi prego quanto posso che la cosa sij secreta perche a me anderebbe la vita." Dispatch of Contarini, Dec. 31, 1522, in Rawdon Brown's *Calendar*, Vol. III., p. 607, *seq*.

torian must acknowledge Sebastian Cabot to have shown himself, on that occasion at least, both an impostor and a traitor.

Not so, however, with a certain Italian commentator, who declares this course and repeated acts of the same kind on the part of Cabot to have been perfectly legitimate and admirable. As to Dr. Dawson, having in mind either the present instance of treachery, or one precisely like it attempted by Cabot against England when in the employ of Edward VI., he meekly observes that "it must be remembered how common it was in those days for sailors to pass from the service of one prince into that of another, and necessarily some negotiations must have preceded every such transfer" (monograph of 1897, p. 185). The less said about this explanation the better.

V.

In connection with Cabot's quatercentenary, the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava delivered a patriotic address in Bristol[1] and wrote an elaborate article for a New York magazine.[2] They are such as to prompt the supposition that, being absorbed by official duties, his Lordship, who is a distinguished man of letters, not having time to make the required searches himself, may have entrusted to some one else the task of preparing the material for his eloquent Cabotian disquisitions. At all events, the monograph contains a number of historical novelties and, to say the least, questionable averments. Let us cite a few:

"Cabot successfully negotiated for King Henry an agreement with the King of Denmark in reference to matters affecting the English trade in Ireland."

This statement occurs for the first time in Anspach's *History of Newfoundland*, written so recently as 1819 (p. 25), and is supported by no authority whatever. Further, there are no traces of anything of the kind in a single known document, printed or manuscript, whether in England or in Denmark or in the *Hanserecesse*, which should contain information on the subject if the statement was true.

"Sebastian Cabot was born in Bristol."

He said so to Eden, in his old age, in England; but it is one of the many falsehoods uttered by him whenever it was to his interest. To be a grantee of letters patent under the Tudors, as well as now, it was necessary to be of full age; that is, 21 years old. As Sebastian figures as grantee in the letters patent of March 5, 1496, conjointly with his father and brothers as second son, he was then not less than twenty-two, and came to life consequently before March 1474. Now, John Cabot was made a Venetian citizen on March 28, 1476, "in consequence of a constant residence of fifteen years next preceding" in Venice:—"per habitationem annorum XV, juxta consuetudinem." Sebastian Cabot therefore was born in that city; further, that was the general opinion everywhere.

---

[1] *London Times*, June 27, 1897.

[2] *Scribner's Magazine*, July, 1897, pp. 72–75.

When the great liveries of London objected to Sebastian being put in command of an English expedition, they intimated to the King and to Cardinal Wolsey, on March 1, 1521, that "he was not naturally born within the realm of England." When he treacherously offered his services to the Republic of Venice, his agent represented to the Council of Ten, in September 1522, that Sebastian was "di questa città nostra." He himself told Gasparo Contarini, the Venetian ambassador at the court of Charles V., on December 30, 1522, "To tell everything to Your Lordship, I was born in Venice, but brought up in England:—Signor Ambassator, per dirve il tutto io naqui a Venetia ma sum nutrito in Ingelterra." Peter Martyr, Navagero, Oviedo, Ramusio, the "Mantua Gentleman," Soranzo, all men of great veracity and high character, who derived their information from his own lips, always call Sebastian Cabot "Venetiano." How can any one presume to set up against this array of positive admissions and logical deductions from authentic documents, the unsupported and solitary statement made to Eden by Sebastian that he was an Englishman by birth, although he represented himself to the envoy of Venice so late as 1551 as a Venetian born?

"*Before his arrival in Bristol,* John Cabot's reputation as an experienced seaman and navigator had been fully recognized."

This novel piece of information rests upon no evidence whatever.

"The more probable conjecture, as well as an *unbroken local tradition,* points to Cape Bonavista, in Newfoundland, as the first land seen."

The word "conjecture" is too elastic to be of much weight in an inquiry of this character. Nor is it, by far, "the more probable." Biddle, Humboldt and Kohl (the latter with the 1544 map before him) conjectured that Labrador was the landfall. Dr. Dawson conjectures that it is Cape Breton; others conjecture that it must be located in Greenland, and even at Salem Neck. As to the "unbroken local tradition" invoked by Lord Dufferin, Dr. Dawson justly makes the following remark: "A tradition presupposes settlers on the coast to hand it down. But there were no settlers for a hundred years after Cabot; the Indians all perished, and when living, their relations with Europeans were relations of hatred and aversion. Even their language perished with them." Besides, John Cabot himself says that he did not see a single living soul: "non a viste persona alguna." Who then could have started the alleged "tradition?" But let us not be too skeptical. This "unbroken tradition" may have been transmitted by the ghosts who were often heard conversing:—"muchas vezes oyen hablar spiritus," according to the ninth legend of Cabot's map.

We also notice the following asseveration: "The conception of an intermediate continent [between Europe and Asia] was absent from the mind of Cabot as it was from that of Columbus" His Lordship then says: "In fact, Cabot's notion was that of a northwest passage."

What for? It stands to reason that if the Atlantic Ocean bathed the shores of Asia, there would have been no necessity on the part of Cabot, or any one else, to go in search of a northwestern strait to reach the Asiatic regions.

"In 1526, Sebastian Cabot set out on an important expedition, whose object was the exploration of the Pacific Ocean, but, owing to the dissatisfaction of his subordinates, this intention was frustrated, and Cabot put into La Plata."

The intention was frustrated because Sebastian Cabot, who showed himself a very poor seaman, and apparently had never led a maritime expedition before, went headlong into the "Black pot,"[1] contrarily to the repeated advice of his pilots. In consequence, after a series of professional mishaps, he lost his flagship in the channel of St. Catherine, which shipwreck decided the fate of the enterprise. On his return to Spain, Cabot, for this and other misdemeanors, was arrested and tried by the Council of the Indies, which found him guilty each time in four successive trials, and sentenced him to four years' banishment in a penal colony in Africa.

"His attempts to found a colony did not prove successful, on account of quarrels with the natives, which in some measure owed their origin to an indigenous chief having fallen in love with the wife of one of his officers."

This extraordinary love-story is a fabrication of the whole cloth (not by His Lordship, however). No officer had his wife with him; nay, no woman whatever accompanied or joined Cabot's expedition at any time.

"Sebastian Cabot threw up the enterprise, and returning to England, made his permanent home among us."

Sebastian Cabot returned direct to Spain in July, 1530, where he was forbidden to absent himself from Ocaña, a town of Castile.

---

[1] See the map in Drapeyron's *Revue de Géographie* for November, 1897.

He did not return to England until eighteen years afterwards, in 1548.

"In 1549 Edward the Sixth gave him the title of Grand Pilot."

Sebastian Cabot never was grand pilot of England. The office did not even exist in the time of Edward the Sixth—Hakluyt to the contrary notwithstanding. It was created about six years after the death of Sebastian Cabot, on January 3, 1563, by Queen Elizabeth, and Stephen Burrough was the first incumbent.

"Before the [second] expedition was ready John Cabot died, leaving the new adventure to be prosecuted by his son . . . Sebastian Cabot started from Bristol in May 1498 with a fleet of five vessels."

There is not a shadow of evidence that John Cabot died before May 1498 and that his son Sebastian sailed then or at any time from Bristol with a fleet. Nay, the name of Sebastian Cabot was not uttered in England in connection with the voyage until March 11, 1521, when the wardens of the great liveries of London expressed the prevailing opinion on the subject in a memorial addressed to the king, to Cardinal Wolsey and to the royal council in these words: "Sebastyan, as we here say, was neuer in that land hymself, all if he maks reporte of many things as he hath hard his father and other men speke in tymes past."[1]

As to the alleged death of John Cabot before the second expedition sailed out, it is interesting to note that the redeeming trait in Lord Dufferin's displays of historic lore is his disclosure of a customs roll showing that John Cabot received payment for a tally of £20, either in London or in Bristol, between September 1497 and September 1498. To all appearances this record is no less than the long-sought documentary proof that John Cabot had safely returned to England from his second voyage in the autumn of 1498, and therefore had not died in April or May next, inasmuch as a similar payment has since been found to have been made to John Cabot in 1499.[2]

VI.

The Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, believing doubtless that he was pleading *pro domo sua*, has imagined, in connection with the quater-centenary, a remarkable theory regarding the origin of the Cabots.[1]

---

[1] Every new document which comes to light substantiates the opinion now entertained by impartial historians on the subject. In the *Geografia y Descripcion Universal de las Indias, desde 1571–1574*, of Juan Lopez de Velasco, cosmographer and chronicler of the Indies under Juan de Ovando (Madrid, 1894, p. 170), we read: "Y Sebastian Gabot dicen que la costee hasta 67 grados a costa del rey de Inglaterra, *sin haber hecho nada en el descubrimiento*:—Sebastian Gabot says that he ranged the coast as far as 67° at the cost of the King of England, [yet] without ever having had anything to do with the discovery."

[2] AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW for April 1898, pp. 449–455.

According to that ethnological lucubration, all individuals in Europe called Cabot or Chabot, or possessing a name resembling one or the other of these, constitute, so to speak, a separate race of human beings.[2] It is surprising that the author should have stopped there. To make his demonstration more convincing he ought to have added that as mankind is divided into distinct races, the Caucasian, the Mongolian, the African, the Shemitic, etc., ethnographers should add to the list the race just found out, viz.: the Cabotian, Gabatian or Chabotian *ad libitum*.

This Cabotian or Chabotian species, we are told, "probably came down in the wake of Rolf the Ganger and settled in the island of Jersey." To establish his postulate, the Hon. Cabot Lodge has ingeniously lighted upon an ichthyological argument well calculated to startle ethnographers and historians, viz.:

"*Chabot* is the name of a little fish, and as it is a fish caught in the neighborhood of the islands of Jersey, it was a very natural emblem."

This Chabot, we regret to say, is only *Cottus gobio*,[3] a fresh-water fish which is extremely common in all the streams of Europe from Italy to Sweden. It may therefore have been also "a very natural emblem" in twenty countries, at least, and not in one exclusively, as is, for instance, the big salamander in Japan.

To make his position stronger, the learned senator advances this other curious piece of ratiocination:

"*Chabot* means also a kind of fish and a measure, and seems to be peculiar in this way to the island of Jersey" (pp. 736–7).

This "peculiarity" is shared with a number of other localities; and were it even otherwise, it would not prove anything. *Chabot* means a certain little fish, but it means also a vine-branch (Sainte-Palaye), particularly in Berry. It has likewise the meaning of a certain kind of toy-top (Godefroy). At Valognes and in Cherbourg *chabot* is the term used to designate half a bushel, just as in Jersey. And as there are in those countries plenty of the small fish called *chabot*, the honorable senator is bound to admit that the Chabotians first came, with or without "Rolf the Ganger," not only to Jersey, but also to all countries where there are or have been human beings called Chabot and at the same time the little fish in question, as well as to all countries in which vine-twigs and toy-tops called *chabots* co-exist with the personal name of Chabot. Another ingenious tenet is the following :

---

[1] *The Home of the Cabots*, in the *Nineteenth Century* for May, 1897.

[2] "The Cabots were a numerous race. We find them scattered all over Europe; the name varied a little here and there; but it is always easily identified." *Op. cit.*, p. 736.

[3] By comparing the plate in Rondelet (Lyon, 1558, fol.) with the arms of the Chabots in Father Anselme's *Histoire Généalogique*, edit. of 1726–33, it is seen that *Cottus gobio*, Lin., is intended. As to the extensive habitat of the fish, see Desmarets in Chenu, and Valenciennes in D'Orbigny.

"The same name and the same arms constitute a proof of identity" (p. 737).

That is, as the Cabots and Chabots all belong to the same "race," they possess or should possess the same arms. This, the Hon. Cabot Lodge has yet to show. Meanwhile, if the Chabots of Poitou bear "d'or à trois chabots de gueules," the Chabots of Torrettes in the county of Nice, and those of Sonville in Gâtinais bear "d'azur à une étoile d'or chargée d'une tour de gueules." The Chabots of Uzès bear "d'azur à un chevron d'or posé en pal ;" Michel Cabot of Brittany bore "d'or à trois têtes de léopards de sable," with no "chabots" whatever in any of them, etc., etc.

Besides, this heraldic theory requires first of all the proof that the seafaring Cabots bore "d'or à trois chabots de gueules." Unfortunately, it so happens that neither John nor Sebastian is known to have ever possessed arms of any kind. The distinguished American senator fancies that he can overcome the difficulty by attempting to connect John Cabot and Sebastian Cabot with the French Cabots de la Fare,[1] who, gratuitously, claim to descend from Lewis Cabot. But it has been demonstrated [2] that this pretension is based entirely upon words of mouth, uttered, so far as documents go, for the first time so recently as 1829.[3] What is more, the assumption is based upon a pretended will, which never was produced, which does not exist, and which is represented to have been drawn by a notary of Alais said to be called Pierre Petit, although there never was at Alais or anywhere else a notary of that name.

As to the motto *Semper cor, caput Cabot*, which the Hon. Cabot Lodge sets forth as the device of Cabotians or Chabotians, and as an infallible means of identifying them, the Cabots de la Fare, upon whom he relies exclusively, themselves confess that it was not coined before the middle of the sixteenth century, and not in Jersey, but in Languedoc.

---

[1] The authority for this statement can only be the *Armorial de la Noblesse de Languedoc*, of Mr. L. de la Roque, which, as regards the Cabots of that province, is based exclusively upon the *ex parte* and uncorroborated assertion contained in the brief cited below.

[2] *John Cabot the Discoverer of North America*, pp. 382–384 ; a work which the Hon. Senator feigns to ignore.

[3] *Cour Royale de Nismes. Plaidoyer pour MM. Cabot de la Fare contre le Cardinal de la Fare.* Nismes, Imprimerie de la Cour Royale, Juillet 1829, p. 31.

The most celebrated and oldest Chabots known are the Chabots of Poitou, where, according to Father Anselme—the highest authority in such matters—they have been known since 1040. The device of the head of the family in the first half of the sixteenth century, the famous Philippe de Chabot, Admiral de Brion, was *Concussus surgo.* Finally, among the Cabots who are the object of the Quatercentenary, the only one who possessed a device was Sebastian, and this device did not read *Semper cor, caput Cabot,* but *Spes in Deo est.*

VII.

To complete the series of Cabotian vagaries it would prove interesting to describe an extraordinary method of solving the cartographical and philological problems involved in the question, and lately exhibited in the *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Canada.*[1] But we must forego this recreation, to sum up the facts relating to the Cabots which have been absolutely ascertained, and the drift of opinion concerning the rest.

The outcome is about as follows:

John Cabot was of Genoese origin, and a Venetian merely by adoption. His son Sebastian was not born in Bristol, but in Venice.

The American continent was discovered not in 1494 but in 1497, and it cannot be said with certainty that the date of June 24 is exact.

The discoverer was John Cabot, and not his son Sebastian, who is now believed not to have been even on board. As to the ship's name the "Matthew," it rests upon a very doubtful authority.

The landfall was neither Bonavista Bay nor Cape Breton Island, so far as evidence goes. Nor was it Cape Chidley, which, however, has not been mentioned otherwise than as the supposed *terminus* of the coasting in 1497.

All we know concerning the second voyage is that in the company of John Cabot's ship, "rigged by the Kynges grace went 3 or 4 moo owte of Bristowe, whereyn dyuers merchauntes as well of London as Bristow aventured goodes and sleight merchaundises, which departed from the West countrey in the begynnyng of Somer 1498." We also know that the fleet had taken supplies for one year, although it was expected back in England in September following, and that it encountered a great storm not far from the coast of Ireland, in consequence of which one of the vessels was disabled and left behind. Finally, we now possess documents tending to show that the previsions of Puebla and Ayala were realized and that John Cabot returned safely to Bristol before September 29, 1498.

---

[1] Second Series, 1897–1898, Vol. III., pp. cxvi.–cxxxii.

As to the rest, whether found in the *Decades* of Peter Martyr, in the legend of the map of 1544, in Ramusio, or in the 1580 edition of Stow's chronicle and the like, it has no other source, direct or indirect, than what Sebastian chose to relate or invent, and his assertions stand uncorroborated to this day. The contradictions, anachronisms and unquestionable mendacity of the man should deter serious historians from making his statements a basis for their arguments, particularly as to what belongs to the first voyage, or what pertains to the second; considering that Sebastian Cabot never speaks but of one only, mixing perhaps the details of the two expeditions, and without our being able to separate the grain from the chaff, supposing that it is not all chaff.

There is no evidence of any kind that he ever aided the Merchants Adventurers in their struggle with the Steel Yard, the downfall of which proved so beneficial to English manufacture. Nor does he deserve the credit, given to him by certain modern writers, of having initiated the British trade with Russia. That important result was due entirely to the foresight, enterprise and pluck of Richard Chancelor, and was won in spite of the instructions which he and Willoughby had received from Sebastian Cabot.

Sebastian Cabot was an inferior mariner, cosmographer, cartographer and scientist generally, who never discovered the variation or the declination of the compass, as many people believe, or the least thing in magnetics; still less the means of finding the longitude at sea, by divine revelation, as he pretended, or otherwise.

Nor is the astute Italian "the author of the maritime strength of England, who opened the way to those improvements which have rendered the English so great, so eminent, so flourishing a people." The extensive researches instituted for the last fifty years in the numerous naval archives and public records of Great Britain have failed to bring out a single indication, however faint, of his ever having had a hand in the maritime progress of England under the Tudors.

To conclude: So far from the encomiums lavished by modern historians on Sebastian Cabot being true, it is proved beyond cavil and sophistry that he was only an unmitigated charlatan, a mendacious and unfilial boaster, a would-be traitor to Spain, a would-be traitor to England.

"*On ne doit aux morts que la vérité.*"

HENRY HARRISSE.

SPAIN AND THE UNITED STATES IN 1795

"SPAIN," says Henry Adams, "had immense influence over the United States; but it was the influence of the whale over its captors—the charm of a huge, helpless and profitable victim."[1] The simile may serve to illustrate the temporary interest which the people of the United States have felt from time to time in the condition of the Spanish empire, but it wholly fails to represent either the real relations of the two countries, or the point of view from which the historian must contemplate their development during the past one hundred and forty years. Throughout that period it is profoundly true that events in Spain have exercised, as they are now exercising, an immense though intermittent influence upon our life. The motives which have shaped the policy of that nation—the causes which have operated upon the acts of her rulers—are well worthy of painstaking study by those who would truly comprehend the history of the United States, and much patient enquiry is still needful before all the forces and all the springs of action are laid bare. Even when the facts are fully known, many things will doubtless remain obscure, for no foreigner may ever hope quite to grasp the workings of the Spanish mind.

It is the purpose of this article to suggest, in the most general way, the manner in which and the extent to which the course of events in Spain affected the early settlement and growth of that part of the United States which lies east of the Mississippi and west of the Alleghanies—a region now embracing ten states, and inhabited by some twenty-five millions of people.

The disputed title to this vast and fruitful *Hinterland* had caused a long and world-wide and bloody war, which was terminated by the cession to Great Britain of the whole of North America east of the Mississippi, except only the island of New Orleans. New Orleans and what lay west of the great river was ceded to Spain. And thus Spain and England, representing then as now the extremes of opposing tendencies in European civilization, were set face to face to solve the problems of this continent. It was the Latin race against the Anglo-Saxon, autocracy against liberalism, reaction against progress, darkness against light.

---

[1] *History of the United States*, I. 340.

The territorial arrangements of 1763, so delicately adjusted for Europe, Asia and America, and which had been intended to secure a firm and lasting peace forever, were rudely disturbed thirteen years later by the revolt of the British North American colonies. France saw in that great event chiefly an opportunity of crippling her ancient enemy. In Spain it awakened hopes of regaining Gibraltar and of consolidating and extending her American possessions. The policy of both France and Spain was purely selfish. There was, indeed, in the former country some popular sentiment in favor of America; but neither love for British colonists nor approval of revolutionary movements, were motives which influenced in the smallest degree the cabinets of Versailles or of Madrid.

Spain was particularly reluctant to favor the American cause. It was only at the repeated and urgent solicitation of France, and after a futile attempt at mediation with England, that she consented to join in the contest. Even then, she fought solely for her own advantage, and the fear of her treachery to the common cause constantly hampered the French diplomacy. Moreover, while Spain enlisted as an enemy to Great Britain, she never became an ally of the United States. Not only did she carefully abstain from acknowledging our independence, but she was in some sense distinctly hostile, and this for reasons which were not then very clearly apprehended.

The moral influence of a successful colonial revolt was no doubt dreaded by the rulers of the nation which then possessed the greatest colonies of the world; but a far more efficient motive of hostility was the desire to perpetuate her settled commercial policy. For nearly three centuries Spain had adhered to the principle of prohibiting any trade whatever between her colonies and foreign countries. Other nations adopted a like policy, but Spain carried it to extremes. She regulated the colonial trade from the Peninsula in the minutest details. The number of ships was limited. The composition of their cargoes and the time of their sailing was prescribed. A single home port enjoyed a monopoly of the business. And all foreigners were rigidly excluded from the colonies. Japan herself was scarcely more hostile to external influence.

The inevitable result of this system was to encourage the wealth and enterprise of other nations to engage in a contraband trade with the Spanish colonies, until—like blockade-running from the Bahamas in 1864—the trade came to be conducted upon orderly principles and rose to the level of a reputable commercial business. It would have required a sincere abandonment of most cherished traditions to deal effectively with a condition of affairs in which law-breaking was made so profitable and so respectable; but of this the Spanish statesmen of that day were not capable. Instead, they regretfully temporized. Monopolies were partially given up and trade to some of the colonies was thrown open by degrees to all Spanish merchants. But even as late as 1778 the annual fleet of plate ships sailed for Vera Cruz.

Thus in 1779, when Spain at last declared war against Great Britain, the old order was passing away, although it still remained an open question whether any further concessions would be needed. The answer to that question depended upon the control of the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea. It was only since the English had possessed the Floridas that any reforms whatever had been required, and if the English could only be excluded from those seas, it was felt in Madrid that unwelcome changes might yet be avoided. The steady growth of the contraband trade quite failed to convince the Spanish government that a permanent blockade of the coasts of two continents was impracticable. Their increasing effort was only to make it more effective, and it was believed that one important step was the acquisition of outlying foreign possessions, so as to keep foreigners at a distance both by land and sea. More and more the policy of isolation from foreign influences—spiritual, literary or mercantile—tended to become the last word of Spanish colonial statesmanship.

Florida Blanca, the Spanish prime minister, always kept these objects steadily in mind. The treaty of April 12, 1779, between France and Spain, which bound the latter to declare war against England, explicitly laid down the ends which His Catholic Majesty expected to attain by prosecuting the war. They were:

1. The restoration of Gibraltar.
2. The cession of Mobile.
3. The restoration of Pensacola and East Florida.
4. The expulsion of the English from Honduras.
5. The revocation of the privilege granted to the English of cutting dye-wood on the coast of Campeche.
6. The restoration of Minorca.

The conversion of the Gulf of Mexico into a Spanish lake was therefore the cardinal principle of the Spanish government in all dealings affecting the United States. And this principle necessarily carried with it the corollary that the Mississippi River must be closed to all foreign commerce. No such right of joint navigation as Great Britain enjoyed under the treaty of 1763 was to be tolerated. "With some degree of warmth" Florida Blanca declared to John Jay in 1780 that unless Spain could exclude all nations from the Gulf of Mexico, she might as well admit all, and that for this reason the King would never relinquish the navigation of the Mississippi. He himself, he added, regarded that as the principal object to be attained by the war with England. If that were but secured, he should be perfectly easy whether or no Spain obtained any other cession. He regarded it as far more important than the acquisition of Gibraltar.[1]

The tenacity with which Spain clung to these views was not understood by Americans. The colonists who had revolted against the selfish and grasping colonial policy of Great Britain were the last people in the world to see with the eyes of those who were endeavoring to perpetuate a far more odious system. Gouverneur Morris, almost alone among American statesmen, comprehended the Spanish motives. "The only reason the Spaniards had for withholding the navigation of the Mississippi River was from the apprehension of a contraband trade," was his remark years afterwards,[2] for even Morris, clear-sighted as he was, did not perceive this at first. The French authorities also, although with far better means of knowledge, only grasped by degrees the full extent of the Spanish purposes. In sending their first diplomatic agent to the United States, the French government attempted to explain the conditions upon which Spain would probably enter the alliance. "There is reason to believe," said Vergennes, "that she would wish to acquire the Floridas, a share in the Newfoundland fisheries, and Jamaica."[3] There was no hint here of closing the Mississippi. Nor was the omission due to any aversion on the part of France to such a policy. On the contrary, as soon as the Spanish demands were made known, the French representatives in America were quite ready to urge upon Congress—often with more zeal than discretion—the importance of yielding everything that was asked.

However, the close of the Revolutionary War came and found nothing settled. The Spanish forces had seized the little British posts along the Mississippi, and at Pensacola and Mobile, and to that extent they had strengthened their position in the negotiations for peace. But they had never recognized the independence of the United States. Jay, after a residence of more than two years in Madrid, had accomplished nothing. He had only carried away with him a promise that instructions for framing a treaty should be sent to the Spanish ambassador in France, and immediately on reaching Paris, he had made an attempt to renew the negotiation;

---

[1] *Diplomatic Corr. of the Amer. Rev.* (ed. 1889), IV. 146.

[2] *Diary*, &c., *of Gouverneur Morris*, I. 347.

[3] Instructions to Gerard, March 29, 1778. Doniol, III. 155.

but he there found new obstacles, to which the attitude of the French government now plainly contributed.

The fact was that the efforts of that court had for a long time been directed towards getting into their own hands the control of the peace negotiations, and they believed themselves to have succeeded. Spain was certain to be amenable. Congress had instructed its commissioners not to insist on the boundaries which had at first been treated as indispensable—not to undertake anything without the knowledge and concurrence of the French government—and ultimately to be governed by their advice and opinion. Even then, the task of the French Foreign Office was full of complications. The treaty of 1778 with the United States had bound France not to lay down her arms until the independence of the United States had been secured. On the other hand, by the treaty of 1779 with Spain, France had agreed that no peace should be concluded until Gibraltar was restored. The problem, therefore, was to secure such terms of peace from Great Britain as should satisfy both the United States and Spain, and yet leave something for France. So far as concerned the United States, independence was the only thing bargained for. The question of the boundaries and the question of the Newfoundland fisheries were matters upon which the treaty of alliance was silent, and the ministers of Louis XVI. felt themselves free to trade away these purely American interests. Spain very probably could not secure Gibraltar; but in her anxiety to close the Mississippi she might be induced to forego Gibraltar if she could be assured a liberal extension of the boundaries of Louisiana to the eastward. Great Britain must, of course, expect to lose her revolted colonies. If, however, the treaty of peace were so framed as to exclude the United States from a share in the fisheries, and were to provide for an expansion of the boundaries of Canada, England might in return be willing to grant the numerous concessions which France was anxious to obtain for herself in the East and West Indies, at Dunkirk and in Senegal.

The plan for sacrificing the United States had long been under consideration, and was now worked out in detail. The boundaries of Canada were to be extended so as to include the whole region west of the present state of Pennsylvania and north of the Ohio; while the country south of the Ohio, between the Alleghanies and the Mississippi, was to be erected into a sort of "buffer state," an independent Indian territory of which the eastern half was to be under the "protection" of the United States, and the western half under the "protection" of Spain. It was the announcement of these designs, coupled with evidence of the want of frankness—to say the least—in the proceedings of Vergennes and his subordinates, that led the American commissioners to adopt the bold step of disregarding their instructions and of carrying through their negotiations with Great Britain without consulting the French government.

When the signature of the provisional articles was announced, and it was learned that Great Britain had agreed not only to recognize the United States, but to admit their right to share in the fisheries, and to bound their territory on the south by the Floridas, on the north by the great lakes, and on the west by the Mississippi, France accepted the result after a good deal of vigorous grumbling. But whether Spain would accept it, no one could tell. She certainly did not do so quickly or willingly. The Spanish court had never expected that Great Britain would make such extraordinary concessions, and when the news reached Madrid surprise and chagrin were everywhere apparent. The general resentment even extended to the conduct of the French government, which was thought to have acted with "precipitation" and was accused of having induced the American commissioners to treat separately in the hope of forcing Spain to peace.[1]

These insinuations against the good faith of France were unfounded, but it was none the less true that the signing of the provisional articles by Franklin and his colleagues did compel both Spain and France to stop the war. The news of Rodney's victory in the West Indies showed that there was no hope in that quarter. The siege of Gibraltar had been raised. France was in grave financial difficulties. Spain was helpless if left to herself. It was plain that there was nothing to do but to take the best terms that could be secured, and accordingly on January 20, 1783, the preliminary articles of peace were signed between Great Britain on the one hand and France and Spain on the other. By this treaty, France in the main reverted to the *status quo ante bellum*. Spain, on the contrary, gained greatly. The island of Minorca and the Floridas,—without troublesome definition of their boundaries,—were restored to her. Never had her colonial possessions been so great as in this last hour before her utter weakness became so strikingly apparent.

A month after the conclusion of peace, Spain consented, although still grudgingly, to recognize the independence of the United States. Even this concession was obtained only through the persistence of Lafayette, who visited Madrid in February, 1783. He found the Spanish court still full of resentment at the success of the Americans. The Spaniards feared the example in their own colonies. They would not even speak about the navigation of the Mississippi.

---

[1] *Diplomatic Corr. of the Amer. Rev.*, VI. 184.

They wished there was no such place as North America. They could see no need for haste in recognizing the United States. They would make no definite promise about the adjustment of the boundary of Florida. All that Lafayette could secure was an assurance that an American *chargé d'affaires* should be received "immediately;" but tremendous difficulties as to the etiquette of presentation at court still remained to be overcome, and it was several months after Lafayette had left Madrid before the recognition of the United States was finally and formally effected.[1]

During the succeeding years the question of the Mississippi was becoming increasingly important for the people of the United States. The rough and dangerous roads which led back to Virginia and Pennsylvania afforded no outlet for the products of the western settlements. Then and for half a century later, the only safe road to market was along the Mississippi; and as long as this road could not be travelled the growth of these fertile regions was effectually checked. For this reason, Jefferson regarded the possessor of New Orleans as our "natural and habitual enemy." The Spaniards at New Orleans had closed the gate to the commerce of Kentucky, and below their outposts no boat could descend the river without Spanish permission. Nevertheless, such was the force of the migratory movement, that the population of Kentucky and the Northwest Territory had grown from a few hundred in 1775 to perhaps twenty-five thousand in 1782. The census of 1790 showed a population of over 110,000. And these figures were to be multiplied nearly four-fold in the next ten years.

Meanwhile, the government of the United States did not relax its efforts to get the Spanish questions settled. In 1787 Jay, who had become Secretary for Foreign Affairs, renewed in New York the negotiations which had proved so fruitless in Madrid and in Paris; but still the Spanish authorities refused even to discuss the navigation of the Mississippi. The "concluding answer" of their agent always was that the King would never yield that point, for it had always been and continued to be "one of their maxims of policy to exclude all mankind from their American shores." And it was Jay's deliberate opinion that the opening of the river to American commerce could never be secured except as the result of an aggressive war.[2] Nevertheless, Congress refused to abandon, even temporarily, what it asserted as "a clear and essential right," and the negotiation was suspended to await a happier opportunity. Nor was the opportunity long delayed; for events in Europe were destined soon to exercise a surprising influence on the final diplomatic result.

---

[1] *Diplomatic Corr. of the Amer. Rev.*, VI. 256–258, 663–667.

[2] *Diplomatic Corr. 1783–1789*, III. 209–215.

The death of Charles III. of Spain in December, 1788, effected a very real change in the Spanish government. For nearly thirty years he had reigned—a benevolent despot, a patron of the arts and of science, an enlightened supporter of the Roman church, and a complete master of his household as well as of his kingdom. His son, who succeeded under the name of Charles IV., had all the virtues and all the peculiarities of his father's house, but so distorted that the likeness became caricature. Like his predecessors, he found his chief amusement in shooting the game that abounded near Madrid; but the love of sport had degenerated with him into a mania that left him no leisure for other occupations. Like his father, he was an excellent husband; but his constancy and devotion not only led him to permit his wife to assume the responsibilities of the throne, but they blinded him to the notorious conduct which made her the talk of Europe. He was kind, religious and well-meaning. His reign began less than six months before the beginning of the French Revolution, and he was so unfortunate as to be utterly lacking in the clear vision and strong character which alone would have enabled him to steer a steady course in the troubled times of the next thirty years. His father—whose stronger nature had greatly impressed him—had allowed him little share in the government; and although forty years of age when he came to the throne, he was quite without views of his own and had no other thought or desire than to continue his father's policy and to lean on his father's advisers. Indeed, the dying recommendation of Charles III. had been a charge to his son to retain Florida Blanca in his service.

Florida Blanca, on his part, stood much in need of the royal support. In his long career he had created many enemies, whose hopes of overthrowing him were encouraged by the beginning of a new reign. Aranda, the ambassador in Paris, the freethinking friend of the milder revolutionists, led the opposition. He was secretly supported by the Queen, who was anxious to get power into her own hands. But Florida Blanca might long have retained his post if a more powerful rival than Aranda had not made his way into favor. Don Manuel Godoy, when Charles IV. came to the throne, was a young gentleman of the king's guards, just turned twenty-one, who, possessing neither education nor fortune, was blessed with a handsome face, good health, pleasant manners and an amiable temper. His personal charms proved a sufficient reason for dismissing the old servants of the crown and putting him at the head of the Spanish empire. Except in the Grand Duchy of Gerolstein his career is without a parallel. In a little over three years he had become a general, a duke and prime minister of Spain; and in three more he assumed the title of prince, after exhausting all the other honors the monarchy could bestow.

The advancement of Godoy kept pace with the march of events in France. It seems to have been at about the time of the fall of the Bastile that he first attracted the Queen's attention, and he was made prime minister less than three months after the day when the storm of insurrection swept Louis XVI. from his throne. Godoy on taking office found Spain hesitating on the brink of war. Diplomatic relations with France had been finally broken off when the French royal family had been imprisoned, but yet Spain, like England, refused to take the last step. The execution of the King put an end, however, to doubts and hesitancy, and early in 1793 war was declared both by England and by Spain.

The neighbors and avowed enemies of the United States, the possessors of Canada and Louisiana and the Floridas, were thus united in a common cause, and the times seemed unpropitious indeed, for a settlement of the vexatious and urgent foreign questions which so sorely perplexed the young nation. So far as our relations to Spain were concerned, the main topics to engage attention had been three:

First, and most important, the opening of the Mississippi;

Second, the settlement of the Florida boundary;

Third, the regulation of commerce.

To these were now to be added the irritating subject of Indian aggressions, and the claims of certain American citizens for illegal captures by Spanish privateers.

This difficult diplomatic situation was aggravated by the impatience of the western settlers and their avowed hostility towards the Spaniards, and still more by the effort of the French government to turn these sentiments to account. The trans-Alleghany region had indeed been for years a field for obscure intrigue by the minor agents of Great Britain and Spain, as well as of France. The conditions invited it. The discontent of the settlers with their political surroundings and with their dependence on the East, had led to loud and vehement threats of secession. From Detroit came hints of sympathy and help, conditioned only on a return to the allegiance of His Britannic Majesty. More substantial inducements were offered by New Orleans. Some of the principal citizens received bribes, and in 1789 the Spaniards went so far as to grant licenses to trade down the Mississippi—perhaps in the expectation that such a favor, granted and then withdrawn, would prove the strongest argument for a dependence upon the favor of Spain.

These licenses did not permit exportation of American produce from New Orleans, nor importation from abroad, and rightly enough the settlers along the Ohio were not satisfied at getting as a revocable favor only a part of what they claimed as their undoubted right. Upon the back of this great and permanent grievance of the closed Mississippi, came the widespread Indian warfare, which there was ample reason to believe was instigated by the authorities in Louisiana.

It was this condition of the public mind—irritation at the inactivity of the Federal government, irritation at the closure of the Mississippi, irritation at the irrepressible Indian outbreaks—that furnished the opportunity for Genet and his agents in the West.[1] The Spanish officials on their part seemed also bent on picking a quarrel, so that by the summer of 1793 Washington and his advisers were forced to the conviction that war with Spain was inevitable.

The American *chargés d'affaires* in Madrid had been instructed at the time of the Nootka Sound troubles to press for a settlement of the Mississippi question, but they had been unable to accomplish any result. They now again attempted to reopen negotiations, but they could find no disposition on the part of the Spanish Court to yield any of the points in dispute. They were told flatly that the King would never permit the United States to share the navigation of the Mississippi, and that the proposed boundary of the Floridas along latitude 31° was "extravagant and unwarrantable." Nor were events in Europe during the summer of 1793 such as to encourage hopes of increasing friendliness. In the Pyrenees, the Spanish forces had been uniformly successful. Hood at the head of the combined English and Spanish fleets had occupied Toulon. The cause of the French Republic seemed desperate, indeed, and the excesses of the Reign of Terror mere symptoms of approaching dissolution.

But as the year drew to its close, the American *chargés* were surprised to observe a different tone in the Spanish Foreign Office. Godoy himself, with characteristic good humor, took up the matter of the Indian aggressions and settled it to the satisfaction of the American government. He expressed disapproval of the conduct of the Spanish agents in America, and he declared that the question of the Florida boundary should be settled "with the utmost dispatch."[2]

A change so marked may well have been caused by the changed aspect of the war. In the months between September and December, 1793, the French government had displayed extraordinary energy. Carnot had organized victory, and the fruits of his efforts were becoming visible. On the very day upon which Godoy wrote his friendly assurances, Toulon was evacuated by the allies.

---

[1] See "The Origin of Genet's projected Attack on Louisiana and the Floridas," AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, III. 650 (July, 1898).

[2] *American State Papers*, *For. Rel.*, I. 439.

Almost at the same moment the Third Congress met in Philadelphia. Washington had been greatly harassed, not only by the hostile attitude of Spain and England, but by the too exuberant affection of France. It was therefore in no very amiable temper that he addressed a special message to Congress on the subject of Spanish affairs. He submitted the correspondence of the past three years, and he pointed out that the acts and declarations of the Spanish agents in America left little doubt of their desire to urge on a quarrel. His only uncertainty was whether they truly represented the views of their sovereign. Upon this point he expected shortly to be enlightened.[1]

Four months elapsed before news came of the more friendly attitude of the Spanish court. On April 15, 1794, the President laid before Congress, without comment, the later correspondence with Godoy; and Congress resolved that in view of the pending negotiations, no steps should be taken looking to war.[2] But though Congress was inclined to peace, it could not restrain the effervescent energies of the West. All that spring the Spanish *chargés* in Philadelphia were kept in a state of perpetual agitation over reports of expeditions about to be undertaken under French leadership. Now it was a force of hundreds of cavalry that was to start from Georgia for the conquest of the Floridas. Now it was a huge expedition under George Rogers Clark that was to set out in flat-boats from the falls of the Ohio, to open the Mississippi once for all. There was a foundation for all these rumors, and it is by no means impossible that if substantial French aid could have been given, and if the Federal government had been willing to wink at such enterprises, important and lasting results might have been effected; but in the absence of French naval support, and in the face of Washington's steady determination, all such attempts were bound to fail.

The news of the projected attacks on the Spanish colonies, and of the distrustful attitude of Washington's administration, reached Madrid in the summer of 1794, at a time when difficulties nearer home were becoming extremely serious. The inglorious result at Toulon had reawakened all the traditional Spanish distrust of England, and the opening of the campaign on the French frontier had proved decidedly unpropitious. The good will of the United States under these threatening circumstances, began to seem better worth cultivating, and the Spanish *chargés* in Philadelphia were instructed to call the attention of the American government to the lack of progress in the pending negotiation, and to suggest that the business might be expedited if a special envoy was sent to Madrid.[1] Accordingly, as soon as Congress met, the President sent in the nomination of Thomas Pinckney of South Carolina—then United States minister in London—to be envoy extraordinary in Madrid. There was no delay in confirming the nomination, and full powers were made out authorizing Pinckney to treat of the navigation of the Mississippi and of all other matters in dispute between the United States and Spain. His commission was dated November 24, 1794. On that same day John Jay in London wrote to James Monroe in Paris that a treaty between the United States and His Britannic Majesty had just been signed.

---

[1] Message of December 16, 1793.

[2] *Amer. State Papers, For. Rel.*, I. 432, 448.

Meanwhile, events on the Spanish border were not standing still. The adverse results of the first engagements of the campaign had been repeated, the Spanish forces sustaining an unbroken series of defeats. The seat of war was transferred from French to Spanish territory, and at the close of the year the Republican troops went into winter quarters holding strong positions both in Aragon and Catalonia.

In his distress Godoy again turned to the United States. Early in the autumn Monroe, the American minister at Paris, was asked to obtain permission for a Spanish agent to visit France—but he very properly declined to be drawn into what looked like an intrigue. He therefore contented himself with laying the request before the Committee of Public Safety—explaining at the same time with entire frankness the unpleasant relations existing between the United States and Spain. He also endeavored to interest the French government in the question of the Mississippi, and he received from them some vague promises that they would try to use their influence, when settling terms of peace, to secure for the United States the points in controversy. It is uncertain whether such efforts were ever really made, and at any rate the only visible result of Monroe's intervention was that Bourgoing—a former ambassador from France to Spain—was sent to the Pyrenees to begin *pourparlers* with the Spanish representatives.[2]

Godoy was not quite satisfied with this mere passive agency, especially when Prussia made peace with France in the spring of

---

[1] Trescot's *Diplomatic History*, pp. 238–245.

[2] *A View of the Conduct of the Executive*, etc., p. 137.

1795. He therefore made advances to Short—now the sole *chargé d'affaires* of the United States at Madrid—with a view to getting the American minister at Paris to treat directly with the French government. Monroe was to play the rôle at Paris which M. Cambon played in 1898 at Washington. It was Godoy's "real and sincere wish," according to Short, to conclude immediately a treaty with France; but he desired to conduct the negotiation in such a manner "that there should be no suspicion of it on the part of England, or the least possible ground of suspicion, until the conclusion and ratification of the treaty." If the French government preferred to send a confidential agent to Madrid, Godoy suggested that the agent should pass as an American. At the same time he gave Short "the fullest assurances" that all the matters in controversy should be "settled to the satisfaction of the United States."[1] A few days earlier the Spanish *chargé d'affaires* in Philadelphia had submitted to the Secretary of State some suggestions for a treaty, but had explained that he was without authority to do more.[2]

Such was the condition of affairs when, on June 28, 1795, Pinckney arrived in Madrid. He was quickly made familiar with the peculiar obstacles to the transaction of business which were created by the habits of the Spanish court. When he reached the capital the court was at Aranjuez, where Pinckney followed and where he was introduced to Godoy. Four days later the court was back in Madrid and Pinckney formally presented his credentials; but the King was there for ten days only, and "of course, everything was in a kind of hurry and confusion unfavorable to business." From Madrid the court removed to La Granja, and three months later to the Escurial; and wherever they went, the American minister was obliged to follow.

At the first interview between Pinckney and Godoy the usual suggestions of delay were made. The Spanish government, it was said, before proceeding further, wished to hear from Philadelphia what answer would be made to the terms which its representative had been instructed to propose. Pinckney replied by producing the letter from the Spanish *chargé*, in which the latter distinctly said he had no power to propose anything. Godoy's next suggestion was that there should be a triple alliance between the United States, France and Spain, and that there should be a joint negotiation between the three powers. This suggestion Pinckney refused even to discuss. He also positively refused a proposition that the United States should guarantee the Spanish possessions in America, at which refusal Godoy "appeared much mortified."

---

[1] *Amer. State Papers, For. Rel.*, I. 716.

[2] Trescot's *Diplomatic History*, pp. 245–247.

Godoy was evidently trying to gain time, and Pinckney was at some loss to understand his motives. It was Pinckney's impression that the French government had urged Spain to acknowledge the American rights, and he feared that his mission would fail unless our controversy with Spain was settled before peace was concluded with France,—an event then obviously close at hand. The growing uneasiness of the West seemed another reason for haste. He determined therefore, as he wrote to the Secretary of State, "to urge the decision as strongly as propriety and attention to my instructions will permit."

On the eighth of August, no apparent progress having yet been made, Pinckney learned to his alarm that a treaty of peace had actually been signed with France. Doubtless to his surprise and relief, this event, so far from impeding, seemed really likely to hasten the negotiation, for on the next day Godoy promised that "the business should be very speedily settled to our satisfaction,"—and said that the King had made up his mind to sacrifice something of what he considered his rights, in order to testify his good-will to the United States. These liberal assurances gave Pinckney new notions as to the motives of the Spanish government. "My present opinion," he wrote, "is that *the new position of Spain with respect to England* will induce them to come to a decision with us."

Thenceforward the negotiation began to move with reasonable promptness. About the 29th of August Pinckney presented the draft of a treaty. On the 20th of September he received a counter-project, to which he made only two serious objections. He insisted upon having a definite arrangement for a place of deposit at or near New Orleans, so that American goods might be freely shipped from river boats to sea-going vessels, and *vice versa*. And he insisted that the American claims for captures of vessels should be arbitrated. As to the right of deposit, Godoy replied that the King would only permit the landing of goods in the custom-house at New Orleans "on paying the storage dues to which his own subjects are subjected," and that this arrangement he would not "vary in the least." As to captures of vessels he was equally positive. He would never sign the treaty unless the questions were to be judged by the Spanish courts.

Finding that Godoy persisted, especially on the right of deposit, Pinckney took what seemed to him the only way of ending the negotiation. On the 24th of October he wrote that as important affairs demanded his return to England, he would on the next day take leave of their Majesties, and that he would "be charmed to execute the orders" with which the Prince of the Peace might honor him for any place on the road. Three days later the treaty was signed.[1]

By its terms, Spain yielded everything the United States had asked. The Florida boundary line was fixed on the line of latitude 31°; the navigation of the Mississippi "in its whole breadth from its source to the ocean" was made free to the citizens of the United States; a right of free deposit was granted at New Orleans; a mixed commission was constituted to settle claims for captures; Indian hostilities were to be restrained; and liberal regulations were agreed upon touching the rights of neutrals, including the vital principle that "free ships make free goods."

The Spanish government had thus placed itself in the unheroic position of Donna Julia:

> "A little still she strove, and much repented,
> And whispering 'I will ne'er consent'—consented."

The fundamental policy of a long line of Spanish statesmen had been abandoned; and foreign observers enquired curiously as to the motives which had prompted the making of such concessions—concessions which Talleyrand thought were certain to produce the worst effects on the political existence of Spain and on the preservation of her colonies.[1] Obviously enough, fear of England was the moving cause. So long as their Catholic and Britannic Majesties were in harmony, there was no hint of any favor to the United States. But just in the measure that the French forces were successful against Spain, so Spain began to be friendly toward America. And finally, when peace with France brought about the certainty of a war with England, the American claims were yielded in full. The further conclusion was inevitable, that the Spanish court must have been actuated by dread of a British attack on Louisiana by way of the Mississippi. An attack by mere filibusters from Kentucky, unsupported by a naval force at the mouth of the river, was not a very serious military menace; but a descent from Canada and Kentucky combined, backed by the power of the British navy, was a prospect not lightly to be disregarded. Such a prospect acting on the mind of a man like Godoy—a man ignorant of the long cherished policy of his predecessors and without fixed principles of his own—whose measures, as Pinckney said, were "adopted from the fluctuation of occurrences and not from system"—might well have induced compliance with anything America saw fit to ask. His mind, moreover, was greatly excited over the ending of the war with France.

---

[1] See Pinckney's correspondence in *Amer. State Papers, For. Rel.*, I. 533–549.

[2] Adams's *Hist. of the U. S.*, I. 356.

He regarded it as an enormous achievement, due to his own skillful management of affairs, and he was probably in that happy state of temper where he could refuse no reasonable request civilly urged. But he was quite able to see clearly that Spain could not long continue at peace with both France and England, and he thought he could provide for the coming war by purchasing the continued neutrality of the one great neutral maritime power, and by converting the western settlements of the United States into a barrier against attack by land.

And so the varying fortunes of the wars of the French Revolution, the weakness of the King of Spain, the infatuation of the Queen, the levity and ignorance of the favorite, all worked together to open to civilization that vast region of the United States which then depended for its very existence upon the free navigation of the Mississippi.[1]

An interesting question remained, as to what effect, if any, Jay's treaty with England had had upon the course of Pinckney's negotiations. Pinckney himself, who had the best means of knowing, seems to have thought that the Spanish government apprehended, as a result of Jay's treaty, a joint declaration of war by the United States and Great Britain against France and Spain. In this view,

---

[1] Godoy's statements are always to be received with much caution, especially when he speaks of his own motives, but as his assertions relative to Pinckney's treaty correspond with the evidence from other sources, they may probably be relied upon. After giving some account of Florida Blanca's policy—which, he says, was to postpone any settlement with the United States while intriguing for the secession of Kentucky—Godoy continues: " C'est en cet état qu'à mon arrivée au ministère je trouvai la négociation, dans laquelle le Gouvernement américain donna beaucoup de preuves de sa franchise et de sa modération. La guerre étant presque aussitôt survenue, entre l'Espagne et la République française, un nouvel incident fit craindre pour la Louisiane une grave commotion. L'envoyé français avait l'ordre secret de révolutionner la colonie et la ramener sous les lois de ses anciens possesseurs. Il comptait sur l'appui des états limitrophes ; il enrôla des soldats, souleva presque tout le Kentucky, et le Tennessée ; il promit à ceux-ci la liberté du fleuve et une partie de la conquête de la Louisiane ; il insulta Washington, foulant aux pieds tous les droits, toutes les convenances. La sage fermeté de cet illustre président et l'attitude sévère du Congrès déjouèrent les plans du diplomate révolutionnaire. Cet homme turbulent fut rappelé sur la demande du Gouvernement Américain. Mais les menaces et les criailleries des provinces de l'Ouest ne cessèrent pas ; on persistait à demander la navigation du fleuve et la fixation des limites.

" Je sentais la justice, la force des raisonnemens allégués par les Américains. La politique, la tranquillité de la Louisiane, la sûreté de ces mers, la nécessité de se prémunir contre une attaque éventuelle de l'Angleterre à l'instant où elle ne serait plus notre alliée, la reconnaissance envers le Gouvernement des États-Unis, dont la conduite avait toujours été si loyale et si modérée, ces divers motifs me déterminèrent à faire approuver par le Roi un traité que je ménageai fort heureusement avec l'excellent citoyen Thomas Pinkeney [sic]."

Godoy adds, what is certainly untrue, that it was fully agreed with Pinckney—though not expressed in the treaty—that in the event of a British attack on Louisiana, the United States would intervene in favor of Spain. See *Mémoires du Prince de la Paix*, III. 36.

Hamilton seems to have shared.[1] On the other hand, Monroe was of the opinion that Pinckney's success was due to the fact that he had reached Madrid at a time when we were believed to stand well with France, and when France supported our claims; and that if Pinckney had arrived a few months later, after France had seen Jay's treaty, and adopted her hostile policy to the United States in consequence of it, the mission would have failed.[2]

Godoy's official utterances supported Monroe. On May 6, 1797, the Spanish minister to the United States, in an angry official note, declared that he was instructed to express the astonishment of his government at discovering that engagements with England had been contracted under Jay's treaty, which were not only prejudicial to the rights of His Catholic Majesty and to the interests of his subjects, but which had been actually entered into "nearly at the same time" that the King was giving such generous proofs of his friendship by the treaty of October 27, 1795. These accusations were merely a part of the effort that Spain was then making to evade fulfilment of the latter treaty, but the pretense of surprise was ludicrously unsupported by evidence. The fact was that the text of Jay's treaty had been published in Philadelphia in July, and had reached France in August, 1795. It was therefore impossible to suppose that the Spanish Foreign Office should not have had a copy by October 27, 1795; or at least before April 25, 1796, when the ratifications of Pinckney's treaty were exchanged. And indeed the American Secretary of State, apparently on Pinckney's authority, explicitly averred that a copy of Jay's treaty was actually in Godoy's hands during the negotiations.[3]

Godoy unofficially, forty years later, said that Jay's treaty was what chiefly influenced his conduct. He had been vexed, he said, at the conduct of the British cabinet in secretly negotiating a treaty with the United States which gave great opportunities for ill-will, and afforded a chance of injuring Spain in her distant possessions; and he endeavored to make another treaty with these same States and had the satisfaction of succeeding.[4] Both of Godoy's assertions could not be true, but the discrepancy is no less inexplicable than the acts of his administration in respect to the execution of Pinckney's treaty. After deliberately agreeing to surrender all of the east bank of the Mississippi north of latitude 31°, a settled purpose was manifested—no doubt under pressure from France—to refuse to carry out the arrangement. But then, just as Godoy was about retiring from office in consequence of French intrigues, orders were given for the surrender of the Spanish posts.

---

[1] Winsor, *The Westward Movement*, p. 556.

[2] *A View of the Conduct of the Executive*, p. 203.

[3] *Amer. State Papers, For. Rel.*, II. 16.

[4] *Mémoires du Prince de la Paix*, I. 342.

The recklessness and indifference of Godoy, and the lax organization of Spanish public offices, may perhaps furnish the key to conduct so mysterious; and it is much to be hoped that researches in the unpublished sources of Spanish history may throw some further light upon the details of a diplomatic episode which had such far-reaching consequences for the people of the United States.

G. L. RIVES.

THE CAREER OF A KANSAS POLITICIAN

THE particular politician, with whom we are concerned, reached Lawrence, Kansas, on the twenty-second of April, 1855, alone and unannounced. He came in a primitive, rickety buggy, drawn by an old, moccasin-colored horse, which, it is to be hoped, had seen better days. The appearance of the new-comer himself was in keeping with his travelling outfit—a man quite forty years old, lank, almost haggard in figure, and dressed in overalls and a round-about. A passer-by who happened to notice him in a casual way as he alighted at the office of *The Free State* newspaper to enquire about Tecumseh, a hamlet twenty miles further west whither he intended to proceed, would have taken him for an itinerant day-laborer. That may have been the first impression in the newspaper office, but it did not last long. The easy, assured manner of the stranger, his quick penetrating glance, the fluency and originality of his talk, soon dissipated any unfavorable conclusions which his country jeans and generally disreputable appearance may have suggested. "Who are you anyway?" somebody finally asked with more bluntness than grace. "My name is Lane," was the reply, "and I hail from Indiana." One of the group happened to be a Hoosier himself and was familiar in a general way with the history of the visitor. So far from being an itinerant day-laborer, he had been a man of considerable political and military prominence—stump-orator, presidential elector, lieutenant-governor, member of the lower house of Congress and colonel of two regiments of volunteers that won distinction in the Mexican war. "My route to the territory," he said in explanation of the peculiarities of his dress, "lay through Missouri. I should have fared badly if I had been recognized. So I adopted this disguise of overalls and a round-about."

But if Lane were to settle in Kansas, why should he go to Tecumseh? That town was still in the experimental stage and might come to nothing. Lawrence, on the contrary, had an assured future. No place in the territory offered greater advantages. To go further would be to fare worse. The suggestion struck Lane favorably. After looking about the village and talking with some of the principal people he concluded to stay in Lawrence, and on the following day published a card announcing the fact.

How did it happen that Lane should betake himself to Kansas in the spring of 1855? The territory had been an unfriendly element in his career. It was his vote for the Kansas-Nebraska bill, while a member of the House of Representatives from Indiana, that ruined his political fortunes in that state. But among all the Northern politicians to whom the support of this measure brought disaster, Lane was the only one who sought to retrieve it by migrating to the debatable ground. Soon after his arrival there, the report got abroad that he had come at the instance of Senator Douglas and the administration to attempt the formation of a new, Anti-Southern Democratic party on the platform of 1852. A Kansas congressman, addressing the House of Representatives in 1866, made the definite statement that Lane, in migrating to the territory, followed "the suggestions of Mr. Douglas and other party leaders." In 1885 a little book, called *The Grim Chieftain of Kansas, by One Who Knows*, appeared which set forth with considerable detail the particulars of his alleged mission. President Pierce and Mr. Douglas, according to the confident author of this volume, foresaw that the South would be worsted in the fight for Kansas. Believing, however, that the territory might become a non-slave-holding Democratic state if matters were wisely managed, they concluded to attempt the task of converting it into a commonwealth of this sort, and solicited James Henry Lane, of Indiana, to act as their representative in the project. After some hesitation he consented to undertake the commission, stipulating by way of consideration that he should control federal patronage in the territory and have the support of the administration in any political ambitions which he might entertain.

Whatever the facts may be, two collateral points are clear: first, Lane, in his later years, when all occasion for deception, if any ever existed, had passed away, stoutly maintained that he came to Kansas as the representative of Mr. Douglas; secondly, he actually attempted to organize a new party in the name of the Illinois senator. The convention, called for this purpose, met in Lawrence on the twenty-seventh day of June. It turned out to be a small affair. Though scarcely half a score of delegates appeared they passed resolutions out of all proportion to their meagre numbers—resolutions in which the necessity for a reformed Democratic party was vigorously asserted.

Five days after the convention, and before the fate of the movement, which it was expected to begin, had become entirely evident, we find Lane at Pawnee, the temporary capital of the territory. His mission there was chiefly domestic. For some whimsical reason he wished to obtain a divorce from his wife, whom he left behind in Indiana. During the territorial period all matters of this sort were adjudicated by the legislature.[1] Lane seems to have expected that his petition would be granted as a matter of course, but he was disappointed. The statesmen at Pawnee could do some extraordinary things. To make even a verbal denial of the right to hold slaves a felony punishable with imprisonment at hard labor for not less than two years was a trifle, but they could not bring themselves to release Lane from his marriage vows. They might have felt differently if he had been the *defendant* in the case—but the present reviewer does not purpose to enter upon a discussion of his domestic affairs.

Members of the legislature used to say that the rebuff which Lane experienced at Pawnee was the turning-point in his Kansas career, but the affair scarcely deserves any such prominence. It must be considered merely as an incident—unexpected, significant, possibly prophetic of evil—not as a capital event. Lane soon became convinced that all his schemes for a new party would end in smoke. Federal office-holders, secure as they supposed in their strong possession of the field, ridiculed the movement. A powerful speech, delivered by Dr. Robinson on the fourth of July, urging all anti-slavery men to stand together until Kansas should be admitted into the Union, was another discouraging event. Besides, the administration remained silent—the most untoward circumstance of all.

It soon became an urgent question with Lane—what next? Apparently he must either abandon the territory or make terms with the anti-slavery people. The return to Indiana would involve humiliations which he was not willing to face. The other horn of the dilemma, though by no means comfortable, seemed more inviting. A life-long Democrat, he had little sympathy with the theories and policies of the "Free State" party. On the contrary, he was in the habit of denouncing the radical section of it as "the offscouring and scum of Northern society." Moreover he had been saying rather freely since his arrival that in the matter of property rights "he knew no difference between a negro and a mule."

About six weeks after his fruitless attempt to establish a party of his own Lane joined the anti-slavery organization. He did not receive a cordial welcome. One man who knew something of his history made a vigorous protest. The speech evidently called for a reply, but instead of an angry retort an interval of silence followed, until finally the chairman, thinking that something ought to be done, shouted, "Where is the redoubtable colonel?" Lane then came forward, and, without noticing the personal attack, proceeded to speak in a very conservative strain. "It requires wisdom," he said, "it requires manhood to restrain passion. . . . Moderation, moderation, moderation, gentlemen!"

---

[1] Some rather awkward complications attended this practice. On one occasion, at least, the presiding officer of the legislative court was co-respondent. "I've got to do the d——dest mean thing a man ever did," he said to a friend just before the court opened. "I've got to preside at the trial of Susie ——." He took an extra glass of whiskey and proceeded to the discharge of his judicial duties!

The general policy of the anti-slavery party had been determined before Lane cut loose from Mr. Douglas and the administration. It involved the repudiation of the "bogus" territorial legislature and its laws, the organization of a state government without the usual congressional enabling act, and application for immediate admission into the Union.

If Lane was an unimportant factor in settling the plan of the campaign, he had to be reckoned with in the execution of it. By a clever ruse he succeeding in securing his own election and that of a conservative delegation from the radical town of Lawrence—the town which Dr. Robinson and the Massachusetts Emigrant Aid Company founded—to the large and important convention at Big Springs on the fifth of September, 1855. It was the first general convention of the "Free State" party. Delegates from every part of the territory, even from pro-slavery towns like Kickapoo and Lecompton, were present—all armed to the teeth. "I remember well, at the rude country hotel," said one of these delegates, "when I asked the landlady for my overcoat, her response—'Go in and get it. I would not touch that armory for all the property in the room.'"[1]

Perhaps the most surprising thing about this convention was that Lane, admitted to membership in the party barely three weeks before and admitted under protest, should have been selected to write the platform. And he prepared one which ought to have satisfied the most ultra "Hunker" in the territory or out of it. This curious pronunciamiento applauded the Dred Scott decision and the Fugitive Slave law, advocated the exclusion of negroes from Kansas, and repudiated, quite superfluously one would think, all sympathy with "abolitionism."

When the constitutional convention, the sequel of numerous preceding conventions, met at Topeka on the twenty-third of October, Lane was elected president of it. As he had been lieutenant-governor of Indiana for one term and consequently president of the state senate, he was not without experience in parliamentary affairs. The convention certainly needed a chairman who appreciated the anomalous conditions under which it convened and the serious perils to which it was exposed, who brought to the conduct of its deliberations not only experience, but the grasp and poise of statesmanship. It embarked upon a movement which had no precedent in the history of the country and was to that extent revolutionary. Other commonwealths may have formed their constitutions without the consent of Congress, but they proceeded in subordination to the territorial authorities. The Topeka convention, so far from acting in harmony with these authorities, made no secret of its purpose to overthrow them. An assembly, meeting under such circumstances, confronted by problems grave and perplexing, conscious that the boundary between the revolutionary and the treasonable is often indistinct, must do its work in an atmosphere of excitement and tension. Upon many of the delegates the criticalness of the situation had a solemnizing effect. It intensified their sense of responsibility, lifted them above all petty and personal considerations to the sanity and disinterestedness which became the representatives of a great cause.

---

[1] Speer's *Life of Gen. Jas. H. Lane, "The Saviour of Kansas,"* Garden City, Kansas, 1895. This book was written, put in type and printed by the author.

What did the president of the convention contribute to the deliberations of these serious days? A brief inaugural speech, occasional remarks more or less pertinent during the debates, the "black law" scheme by which negroes were to be forbidden the new state, incessant factional intrigue and—the preliminaries of a duel. One of the delegates happened to repeat certain damaging stories, which were current, in regard to Lane's private morals. The truth of the stories nobody denied, but as they were proving harmful to his political aspirations, something must be done to counteract their effect. His election as president of the convention had been a useful testimonial of confidence. What would be more likely to emphasize and re-enforce this testimonial than a challenge, especially if it should be declined? Contrary to all expectations the troublesome delegate sent a prompt acceptance. As Lane neither wished nor intended to fight, the situation was awkward and his friends had difficulty in extricating him from it. Indeed they found no easier way of escape than to withdraw the challenge and to make satisfactory apologies. The episode, sprung upon the convention for purposes wholly personal and dramatic, rudely crossed the current of its deliberations.

Apparently Lane soon forgot his personal griefs. At all events he issued a proclamation appointing the twenty-fifth of December a day of territorial thanksgiving and praise shortly after the convention adjourned. The people had suffered much, he said from those whom they would be glad "to recognize as brothers," yet it now seemed possible for them to secure the blessings of liberty and good government "without embruing their hands in blood."

The felicitation was premature. Lane's thanksgiving proclamation bore the date of November 27. On that very day, such was the irony of fate, the governor of the territory issued a war proclamation, ordering the military authorities, after collecting as large a force of volunteers as possible, to report for service to the sheriff of Douglas County. This doughty official had arrested an antislavery man in the vicinity of Lawrence on some trumped-up charge. A few friends planned and executed a successful rescue. It suited the mood of the sheriff to hold that town responsible for the affair. He thought that no better opportunity would probably offer for "wiping out the d——d abolition hole"—an enterprise dear to his heart—and he soon appeared, accompanied by ten or twelve hundred armed Missourians, to make the most of it.

Lane was the only man in the threatened town with a military record. At the battle of Buena Vista he commanded the Third Regiment of Indiana Volunteers, and, according to the official report of the brigadier-general, he and his men on that occasion "did infinite honor to the state and nation which gave them birth." After the expiration of the term of service, for which this regiment enlisted, Lane raised another, the Fifth Indiana, followed General Scott to the city of Mexico, and had the honor among other things of capturing Santa Anna's wooden leg. His military reputation grew fast up and down the border. In a surprisingly short time the opinion had become current that he must be "a powerful fighter." But in spite of his military experience and reputation the citizens of Lawrence declined to entrust him with the direction of affairs in this grave crisis, and elected a civilian, Dr. Charles Robinson, commander-in-chief. Evidently something had happened in the past six months which disturbed their confidence in the veteran of the Mexican War. The civilian, suddenly raised by vote of the town to the rank of major-general, adopted tactics of the Fabian type. He set Lane to drilling the little garrison, which comprised all the male inhabitants of Lawrence who could bear arms and volunteers from neighboring towns, and to digging rifle-pits. If attacked he would fight, not otherwise. Why should a thousand armed Missourians lay siege to Lawrence because certain persons, for whom it disavowed all responsibility, had assaulted a local sheriff? The invaders themselves soon came to be troubled by this question. If somebody should happen to attack them it would be a god-send. But the obstinate town persisted in its defensive tactics and the gallant invaders, who marched up the hill, concluded to march down again.

This famous "Wakarusa War," in which there was not a gun fired, would have had a different conclusion if our "powerful fighter" had been in command. He thrust a challenge into the proceedings of the Topeka constitutional convention for the purpose of making a sensation and of exploiting himself. In the siege of Lawrence there was another and a more serious illustration of Lane's eccentricities, to use no harsher word. At the crisis of affairs, when the tension was acutest, he made secret preparations for a night attack upon the Missourians. If this sortie had taken place it would probably have changed the whole character of Kansas history. Some one—it was the member of the constitutional convention who embarrassed Lane by accepting his challenge—reported the affair at headquarters and it was promptly suppressed.

In the festivities which followed upon the conclusion of peace—the "War" lasted scarcely two weeks—Lane appears to have forgotten his frustrated sortie. "With a desperate and wily foe already in your midst," he said in a speech of congratulation to the disbanding volunteers, "you restrained your fire determined . . . to compel them to take all the responsibility of a battle which you believed would shake the Union to its very basis."

The sheriff of Douglas County created no little disturbance, but it was quickly over and the movement toward a state government went forward as if nothing had happened. In due time the necessary machinery was provided, ready to be put in motion when it pleased Congress. Lane went to Washington in the spring of 1856 with a memorial of the "General Assembly of the State of Kansas," praying for immediate admission to the Union under the Topeka constitution. The appearance of this document in the Senate raised a storm. It was described as "a petition coming from a self-constituted, arrogant and usurping body." "I do not know," said Senator Butler of South Carolina, "that I ever felt on any occasion more sensibly an insult offered to the Senate of the United States." Unfortunately the document itself afforded ground for suspicions, since it abounded in erasures and interlineations, and the signatures were all in one hand-writing. "I do not believe," said Senator Rusk of Texas, "that this paper ever saw Kansas." Then "who is Mr. Lane, the bearer of the memorial?" it was asked. Senator Mason of Virginia called attention to the fact that no one rose to answer the inquiry and to say that Mr. Lane "is what he claims to be, an honorable man."

The memorial was withdrawn. Most men would have said that it had been damaged beyond all possibility of repair, but the bearer of it thought differently. A few days later Senator Harlan of Iowa presented an affidavit, sworn to by Lane before a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, to the effect that the annexed "twenty-four half-sheets of paper" contained the original draft of the Kansas memorial and that he was authorized to revise it. He also explained that the members of the legislature "executed three sets of signatures," which were to be attached to revised copies of the memorial, but they had been mislaid and he ordered them to be subscribed from autographs in his possession.

Senator Harlan, in presenting the affidavit, took occasion to say that he felt humiliated because he could not rise in his seat, when the memorial was first before the Senate, and answer the sneering question, "Who is James H. Lane?" He had been looking into the history of the country, meanwhile, and proceeded to give a pretty full sketch of the apparently forgotten politician who stumped Indiana for every Democratic presidential candidate from Martin Van Buren in 1840 to Franklin Pierce in 1852. But neither original documents nor biographical sketches proved of any service. The unfortunate memorial got no better treatment on its second appearance than it received at first. Mr. Douglas surpassed even the senators from South Carolina and Texas in the violence of his denunciations. "I submit," he said, "whether here is not evidence of the most glaring fraud ever attempted to be perpetrated upon a legislative body." The bearer of the memorial replied to these charges—by a challenge. Mr. Douglas declined it.

The campaign in Washington was disastrous. It could not have succeeded in any event, but poor generalship converted what might have been an orderly retreat into a rout.

Lane's career abounds in contrasts. His pretentious affidavit, his useless "twenty-four half-sheets of paper," his ineffectual appeal to the code were succeeded by a period of extraordinary oratorical triumphs. After the failure of the memorial he visited many of the principal Northern cities to speak in behalf of Kansas. His singular ability "to talk men over" had already attracted attention in the territory, but it did not obtain any general recognition until the presidential campaign of 1856.

Lane was almost wholly a product of the border. The inspiration and the opportunity of his surroundings contented him. In this respect he was quite unlike his contemporary, and in later years, as we shall see, his great friend and patron, Abraham Lincoln, who also came up out of the wilderness. A noble discontent with the world about him drove the latter to the refuge of books. He read them in the early light of the morning and by the last embers on the hearth at night. They stimulated his thirst for knowledge, enlarged and chastened his vocabulary, broadened and deepened his intellectual vision. Lane, on the contrary, missed everything that books can give a man. He did not care for them—had none of the finer mental aptitudes, none of the mysterious spiritual qualities which crave their ministry. His education, such as it was, came from the public street and corner grocery, from the bar-rooms of country taverns and the political convention. This education served his uses well, as his one particular talent lay in the line of public speech, and it gave him abundant opportunities for practice. He became a past master in the picturesque, bizarre dialect of the frontier and was able "to mount his stump . . . or other ready elevation," and pour forth eulogy, invective, ridicule or declamation as "any occurrent set of circumstances" might demand.

Lane's manner was always impassioned and sometimes frantic. No book of oratory can be found which would sanction his gesticulation. At the outset he might be calm enough, but the period of restraint, especially if he were dealing with a hostile audience, or with one stirred by some great passion, did not last long. Signs of passion soon began to appear, which deepened and intensified until finally coat, vest and necktie were pulled off, while his voice vibrated between shouts and blood-curdling whispers. "If his body had been made of combustible matter it would have burnt out," John Quincy Adams wrote after listening to a speech by Stephen A. Douglas. Lane's gesticulation was even more violent and fiery.

This "mouthpiece of chaos" may not have been an artist, but what of that? The final test of public speech is its immediate effectiveness. It addresses the ear, not the eye. The first, the essential life of it belongs to the hour and the audience. Whether it shall have a second life as literature, whether it will bear reproduction in type, is another matter. Very often that which thrilled the listener, bores the reader. Lane met this crucial test triumphantly. He created a great sensation wherever he went. Senator Doolittle of Wisconsin said that, though his experience in political campaigns had not been small, he never saw audiences so profoundly moved.

It was at Chicago that Lane won his greatest triumph. Ten thousand men gathered to hear him. He had a congenial theme—border ruffians, invasions, murders, a heroic constituency battling for the rights of man—and his weird, dramatic, startling oratory showed at its best. The vast multitude was roused to an enthusiasm which took the shape of volunteers and contributions as well as of tremendous applause. Newspapers of the next morning declared the meeting to be the most remarkable ever held in the state.

"We believe," said one of them, "that it will inaugurate a new era in Illinois."

Affairs were going badly at the front in the meantime—Lawrence pillaged by the persistent sheriff of Douglas county; the Topeka legislature dispersed; writs issued for the arrest of anti-slavery leaders on charges of treason, and Missouri preparing for an invasion which should settle the tedious and irritating controversy. Late in the summer Lane, his tour of speaking finished, ventured back into the territory incognito, as he happened to be included among those who had been indicted for treason and feared arrest. But his presence did not help the situation, which went steadily from bad to worse until the arrival in the early autumn of 1856 of a new governor, John W. Geary, who succeeded in bringing a temporary order out of the confusion. He sent the invading bands of armed Missourians about their business. Lane and "other meddling agitators," much to the relief of the inhabitants of Lawrence, as we are informed by an entry in the Executive Minutes, took refuge in Nebraska.

But Lane, even in exile, found little rest for the sole of his foot. He was scarcely out of the territory when he received a challenge from "two aged men . . . to name two or ten of his followers" who should arm themselves "with muskets, rifles, shot-guns or revolvers" and meet an equal number of pro-slavery men at short range on the field of honor. Evidently the bloody instructions, which Lane was accustomed to teach, returned to plague him. He did not like the terms which these "two aged men" offered and made a counter-proposition to the effect that he and Senator Atchison supported by one hundred picked men on a side should arbitrate the fate of Kansas by wager of battle in the presence of twelve United States senators and twelve members of the House of Representatives. This counter-proposition reproduced quite literally the terms of that famous old-time fight between Palamon and Arcite, though the author of it probably had never heard of those war-like youths. Neither Senator Atchison nor the "two aged men," nor anybody else saw fit to accept the revised challenge. This particular disturbance soon blew over, but it was succeeded by others, especially at Nebraska City, where a local newspaper, then published by Ex-Secretary J. Sterling Morton, made a sharp attack upon Lane. Some of his men proposed by way of retaliation to mob the office, and it was with considerable difficulty that they were prevented from carrying out their purpose. The affair caused so much excitement and bad feeling that Lane called a public "conciliatory meeting," which opened in a very boisterous and unpromising fashion.

A great many armed Missourians had taken the trouble to be present, not, however, in the interest of peace and good-will. Lane's oratory was equal to the emergency. He began by congratulating himself on the fact that so large a portion of Missouri had responded to his call for a conference. Intimate friends of his and comrades in arms had been citizens of that state. He fought in the Mexican War side by side with the gallant Colonel Doniphan, known and honored by every man before him. If he were here to-night what feasting would there be in harmony and love. Like the gentlemen from across the river he was a Democrat. With their domestic institutions he had no wish to interfere. They might keep these institutions if they were so disposed. He himself once believed in slavery. Let the gentlemen listen to the story of his awakening. It happened years ago that he went to the house of a sugar planter with a young carpenter, who wished to obtain work. After learning the object of their visit, the planter "laid himself back with his thumbs in the armholes of his vest and replied, 'I bought two carpenters yesterday.' Great God! If such men are buying carpenters, machinists, engineers, how soon will they sell you and me in their marts of human merchandise!"

When Lane concluded his speech the Missourians, who had intended to use their knives and revolvers before the meeting was over, applauded him no less enthusiastically than his own men.

The riddance, for which the citizens of Lawrence were so thankful, lasted six months. At the end of that period Lane returned to the territory. The administration of Governor Geary had just closed and that of Robert J. Walker and Frederic P. Stanton was beginning. With their advent the contest shifted somewhat. Armed invasions from Missouri were at an end, and it remained to be seen what the slave-power could accomplish by other agencies. Would it be possible to keep possession of the territorial legislature? The time for a new election approached. It was a question, much debated among the anti-slavery men, whether they should take part in it. Two conventions were called for the purpose of discussing the subject. In the first Lane opposed the policy of making a contest, in the second he favored it and found himself on the winning side. The anti-slavery party carried the election and got possession of the legislature, whose statutes and enactments they had so stubbornly repudiated.

Though the loss of this election seemed to be a crushing defeat, the pro-slavery leaders were not disposed to abandon the field. One desperate chance of retrieving their fortunes remained and they did not hesitate to embrace it. Possibly something could be done through the agency of a constitutional convention. Such a movement had been under way some months, and culminated in what is known as the Lecompton Constitution. The pro-slavery managers declined to submit this instrument as a whole to the people, knowing very well that such a course would be fatal to it. Upon certain questions, relatively unimportant, they would allow a vote. But the constitution the people should have whether they wanted it or not, and the slaves still remaining in the territory—some four hundred in number—and their natural increase, must not be meddled with. President Buchanan sent this constitution to the Senate, accompanied by an urgent recommendation that Kansas be admitted to the Union under it, a recommendation which that body adopted.

The policy of the administration created intense excitement in Washington and elsewhere. "I have no advice to give the people of the territory of Kansas," said Senator Hamlin of Maine, "but I can say this: . . . if Congress shall, in its power, undertake to force a constitution and a state government upon that people, . . . they are only fit to be slaves, and they will be only slaves, if they do not resist it to the last extremity."

The people of Kansas scarcely needed exhortation to resist the Lecompton Constitution. Never before had they been in so dangerous a mood. Lane was in his element. It is a wonder that his incendiary stump oratory did not precipitate an actual outbreak of "Chaos and Gehenna." He went everywhere, preaching the doctrine of violence with a volcanic energy. A speech delivered at Leavenworth, November 14, 1857, furnishes an example of his style and method. "These villains," he said, referring to the members of the Lecompton Constitutional Convention, "these villains have forfeited their lives to an injured people. . . . Commence at John Calhoun, the president, and go down to Batt Jones, the hero of Oxford, and a blacker set of villains cannot be found. Truth—they know not what it means. Honesty—they don't know that it has an existence. I say that John Calhoun should have written upon his tomb-stone (if he ever die) 'Felon, Felon, Felon.' . . . I am not going to advise war or bloodshed to-night, for perhaps there is no need of that. We have got the goats so separated from the sheep that we can easily kill them without committing crime. For I truly believe that should God show his special providence here to-night, we should see in these starry heavens his hand, commanding us to kill those damned villains. . . . I say hang them, hang them to-night!"

Neither John Calhoun nor Batt Jones was hung. Other and milder measures served every purpose. Acting-Governor Stanton called an extra session of the recently elected legislature, which promptly passed an act submitting the Lecompton Constitution to the people and they rejected it by an overwhelming majority.

The slave power now gave up the struggle for Kansas. Yet the apprehensions and alarms of Lane did not subside at once. On the contrary, when General Denver became acting-governor, December 21, 1857, they received a fresh and violent lease of life. Soon after his appointment the new magistrate took occasion to denounce "those lawless and restless men who are never satisfied except when engaged in some broil." A little later Denver, not content with generalities, proceeded to post "one J. H. Lane" as a demagogue. The latter had been appointed major-general of volunteers by the legislature and had undertaken to compose certain troubles in Southern Kansas, but his presence in that section created more disturbance than it quelled. Lane replied in a furious card: "I do arraign one J. W. Denver before the country and denounce him as a calumniator, perjurer and tyrant. . . . For base political purposes he has sought an excuse for a difficulty with me, and . . . has fastened a personal quarrel upon me. As a personal quarrel it is private property, . . . I respectfully demand that there may be no interference on the part of my friends."

Lane, however, did not fail to let his friends know what he was doing. "One night about 10 o'clock, in the spring of 1858," said Captain Samuel Walker, then deputy sheriff of Douglas county, to the writer, "a messenger came in hot haste to my house—I lived in the country, three or four miles from Lawrence—and told me that I was wanted in town at once. I mounted my horse and hurried to the village. On my arrival I learned that Lane wished to see me. I found him with a number of intimate friends in his room at the Johnson House. When I entered he was writing and did not notice me. The task which appeared to absorb him so completely turned out to be the drafting of his will. When he had finished the document he read it to the company. Then, turning to me, he said, 'I have sent Denver a letter that will compel a hostile meeting. Now I do not want you as sheriff to interfere and prevent it.' 'But Denver is a dead shot,' I answered, 'and we can't spare you yet.' 'As the challenged party,' Lane replied, 'I shall have the choice of weapons. Do you see that gun in the corner? It's a Sharpe's target rifle, and another cannot be found in the territory. I shall choose it.' I saw quickly enough that there would be no fight. In the morning I rode over to Lecompton and called on Denver. He told me he had received an insulting letter from Lane, but laughed at the idea of sending him a challenge."

This melodramatic fiasco did not conclude the Denver episode. A second chapter followed which was brief but sensational. Since his old and favorite resource, the code, had failed him in dealing with the case, Lane determined to see whether better results might not be secured through the agency of a secret society. He therefore instituted one and gave it the significant name of "Danites." An atmosphere of profound mystery invested the organization. People wondered what the unknown perils, which called it into existence, could be. When the time came for definite statements there was a large attendance and it included many of the most conservative and respected citizens of Lawrence. Upon Lane as founder of the order and chief depository of its dark mysteries devolved the task of exposition. He rose with an air of tragic solemnity and said that at no period in the history of the territory had the situation been more critical than at the present moment. In the governor's chair there sits an unscrupulous and desperate man, a professed duellist, his hands reeking with human blood, a tool of the administration and in full sympathy with our enemies. Let a committee be appointed, a trustworthy, patriotic committee, who will carry through anything they may undertake without flinching. Let the committee lie in ambush for this man and rid the territory of him forever!

Lane concluded amidst the profoundest silence, which a member of the order, who could no longer repress his indignation, broke by exclaiming, "If this is a nest of d——d assassins, you may count me out." There was a general desire to be counted out and the meeting came to an abrupt conclusion.

Three days before Governor Denver warned the people of the territory against "one J. H. Lane," the President of the United States characterized him, in a message to congress, as "a most turbulent and dangerous" military leader. Lane replied to this attack in a speech delivered at Lawrence, February 13, 1858. He realized that a successful personal defence would be difficult in the presence of men who heard his address before the society of "Danites" or who were at Leavenworth when he considered the case of John Calhoun and Batt Jones, and he passed lightly over this phase of the subject. Waiving personal considerations, he devoted himself to a general review of the territorial history and spoke with a candor and fairness, with a sobriety, a directness and comprehension which surprise us. In this sanest of his Kansas speeches Lane declared that the policy of the anti-slavery *party* had been pacific. "At the great delegate convention held at Big Springs in September, 1855," he said, "it was unanimously resolved, after full discussion and deliberation, not to organize in resistance" to the territorial government. "We adopted the *let alone* policy, neither resorting to nor resisting it. This plan was embraced as the peacefully legal one in preference to organized resistance to the territorial laws, to save the effusion of blood and to avoid those laws instead of coming in conflict with them." The people of Kansas, "patriotic, patient and peace-loving," the victim of frauds which would have driven any other community "into bloodshed and civil war," were never in arms "except to resist invasion from other states" and that after protection had been refused. A scheme of state government was devised in the interest of peace. When the Topeka movement fell into some discredit another constitution "was tendered in a Christian and patriotic spirit for a speedy and just settlement" of the controversy. Speaking of the territorial history in the Senate of the United States four years later, he made a similar statement. "In 1855, 1856, 1857 and 1858," he remarked, ". . . Kansas acted exclusively on the defensive." Though Old John Brown and the young men who wrote for the Eastern press dissented; though in the temptations and exasperations of the struggle Lane's hare-brained schemes as well as his lurid stump oratory often ran counter to this theory, yet his statement is true in regard to the tactics which the anti-slavery party adopted and on the whole successfully carried out.[1]

Unaccountable as it may seem, the Denver episode did not relegate Lane to private life. But what that crazy affair failed to do was very nearly effected by a common-place incident of the border, a claim dispute. Richardson, in his *Beyond the Mississippi*, relates that one day in June, 1858, as he sat in the office of the Lawrence *Herald of Freedom* writing, he heard a cry on the street—"Jim Lane has killed Gaius Jenkins." Hurrying to the scene of the affray Richardson found Jenkins dead and Lane disabled by a wound in the knee. The quarrel, which came at last to this deplorable issue, had been in progress two or three years. Jenkins accused Lane of "jumping" a claim that belonged to him. On this fatal day in June, accompanied by three armed men, he invaded the disputed premises and began to cut down an obnoxious fence. After warning him to desist, and after his own life had been threatened, Lane fired the deadly shot. Whatever the equities of the case may have been, technically the contention of Jenkins could not be sustained—such, at all events, was the conclusion which the Department of the Interior finally reached.

---

[1] Kansas history is not very ancient, but if we may believe certain recent writers, "a curious myth," for which Governor Robinson is said to be mainly responsible, has already grown up concerning it. This myth is the "theory that there existed from the beginning two well-defined parties, the one wishing to carry its ends by war, the other by peace." Neither Governor Robinson, nor any body else, so far as the present writer is aware, holds this theory. Lane did not misrepresent the action of the Free State party. The speech and practice of a good many individuals may have been out of harmony with the resolutions at Big Springs; some of these individuals may have failed of consistency either in speech or practice—but all that is neither here nor there.

Lane won the land, but he paid a heavy price for it, far heavier than he meant to pay. The tragedy, so his friends said, "put a burden upon his soul which never lifted." Months of profound depression succeeded. One who met him on the streets of Lawrence in these dark days described him as "care-worn, haggard, reduced almost to a skeleton, the picture of despair." Politically his career seemed to be finished, so powerful was the current which the homicide set in motion against him. It is an interesting fact that Lane's return to public life, after more than a year of seclusion, should have been in a certain authentic sense by way of the church. "I baptized him August 29th, 1859," said the Rev. Mr. Dennis, "during a camp-meeting near Baldwin City. He manifested much feeling and answered all the questions readily." An element of religion, assumed or genuine, had not been wanting in his career. His piety, it is true, sometimes took on a peculiar shape. For instance, on his overland journey through Missouri *en route* to Kansas he stopped one day at a farm-house for dinner. "It is my custom," he remarked to his hostess, "to say grace before eating." After staring at him for a moment incredulously the woman replied, "Go in, then, old fellow." According to the traditions he subsequently visited Missouri disguised as the Rev. Mr. Foote, of Alabama, in order to familiarize himself with the topography of the state, thinking that possibly such information might some time be useful. He preached, it is said, on occasion, and awakened great enthusiasm by his denunciation of the Kansas abolitionists.

More than three years elapsed between Lane's application for admission to the church and his baptism at Baldwin City. The application was made during a series of revival services in the Methodist church at Lawrence—to the surprise of everybody. Near the close of one of the meetings he rose and began: "Sixteen years ago an aged, pious and widowed mother lay dying. She called her eldest son to her bedside and said, 'Henry, it is my desire that you should have religion, and that, if consistent with your feelings, you should find it within the Methodist church.' What could that son do but make the pledge? To-night he appears before you to redeem it. Wicked as he may have been, he desires to be received on probation into the church of which she was a life-long and consistent member." These words made a profound impression. "Great God!" exclaimed the leader, the Rev. Mr. Dennis, who soon proceeded, however, from exclamations of surprise to a little good advice. "My dear brother Lane," he said, "we rejoice to hear your decision, but you will have a very narrow way to walk in. It will go out, 'Lane has joined the church.' Let men and devils know that you are earnest and honest." Whatever the devils may have thought, some men scoffed. As these periods of piety were fragmentary and often coincided with periods when "endorsements" and fresh certificates of good character would be useful, they regarded Lane's connection with the church as a move in the game of politics and nothing more. Unquestionably he had a loose and troubled possession of religion, but shall we deny to the inconstant phases of it all traces of sincerity and genuineness? Lane's own philosophy of his religious life may be as satisfactory as any. A certain speech, that he delivered at Leavenworth, fairly smoked with profanity. Some of the auditors were disgusted and took him to task. "Why," he replied in surprise, "I am a pious man. Just now, to be sure, I may not be quite up to the devotional point!" Lane's theological and ethical sentiments, it must be admitted, were unconventional. "God himself marches before us," he said, in an address on the issues of the day, before the Leavenworth Library Association, January 27, 1862, "and for my part I would just as soon follow him as any other leader!"

With the admission of Kansas to the Union in 1861 a new epoch opened for Lane. The territory interested him mainly as a convenient stepping-stone to the Senate, but the obstacles which must be overcome were very great. His blunders and follies would have ruined any ordinary man. In addition to all other burdens and disabilities he had no money. The wolf was often at his door. "I have been refused credit for a loaf of bread in Lawrence," he said on one occasion, "and my family have not even the necessaries of life." When the senatorial contest opened, Lane succeeded in borrowing twenty dollars, proceeded to the capital and opened head-quarters in one of the hotels. Efforts were made to induce his landlord to turn him out of doors on the ground that he could never pay his bills, but the plot failed. If it should succeed he swore that he "would move into a dry-goods box and get ahead of the hounds." He did get ahead of them. After a campaign remarkable for its vicissitudes and uncertainties this "demon of the impossible" carried his point and reached the Senate of the United States.

"Now we shall see what a live man can do," said Lane when he left Lawrence for Washington. He set forth "to climb after his desires" with tireless energy and confidence. And these desires soared to no ordinary pitch. The belief had long haunted him that some day the people of the country would call him to the highest office within their gift. Many were the conferences, which he held with intimate friends, on this subject. When it was once suggested that the Jenkins affair might prove troublesome he replied, "Oh that won't make any difference. General Jackson was a duellist and I don't believe that the killing of a man in self-defence will hurt me." The difficulties of organizing and conducting a national political campaign were mentioned. He thought there would be but little need of machinery. "If the young men of the territory will go into every Northern state and get up another Kansas excitement, nothing more will be necessary."

Lane reached Washington in the early days of the war. His first notable service lay outside the halls of Congress—the organization of a company of volunteers for the protection of the President. On the 18th of April, 1861, he received a request to report immediately with his men at the White House. About dusk the company followed him into the great East Room, where they bivouacked. In the middle of the night, Mr. Lincoln, arm in arm with Secretary Stanton, is said to have appeared at the door and gazed upon the spectacle with an expression of profound sadness.

Lane quickly became an important man in Washington. At one period, such were the frequency and urgency of his communications with the War Department, a carriage stood before his lodgings day and night, ready for instant use. Mr. Lincoln liked him and accepted without qualification his version of border affairs. "You can hardly conceive," General Hunter, who commanded the military department of Kansas wrote early in 1862, "to what an extent the authorities at Washington have carried their faith in the representations of Mr. Lane." The most violent domestic feuds were raging in the new state, a legacy from the territorial days, as they really began with the accession of Lane to the anti-slavery party. It soon became evident that, in the critical condition of affairs, he was not a safe leader, and that somebody must undertake to keep him within bounds, or, if that could not be done, to minimize the effect of his eccentricities and lunacies. The brunt of this disagreeable business fell upon Dr. Robinson. Sooner or later an open rupture was inevitable, and Kansas has reason to be thankful that he did not shrink from it. When Lane got the ear of the Washington authorities he won a great temporary advantage. Apparently they accepted his customary description of Robinson, who had become governor of the state—a description which lacked neither point nor emphasis—"slanderer, traitor and coward." Hence they authorized him to raise regiments, to appoint their officers, and to usurp other functions that belonged exclusively to the governor. But partisans of Lane insisted that official red tape must not be allowed to abridge his career. They attributed to him phenomenal military genius. "He has every quality of mind and character," said *The Leavenworth Conservative*, "which belonged to the historical commanders. . . . Put Jim Lane at the head of our armies, and instead of months of idleness we shall have victories every day and a restored union in six months." Mr. Lincoln may have been less enthusiastic in his admiration, but on the 20th day of June, 1861, he wrote the Secretary of War that the services of such a man as Lane were needed in Kansas. "We had better appoint him a brigadier-general of volunteers to-day," he continued, "and take such measures as will get him into service quickest." It turned out—the matter caused a great deal of discussion in the Senate and elsewhere—that Lane never technically accepted the appointment. Yet the fact that he held no military commission did not prevent his taking the field and operating on the western border of Missouri "with a smart little army of about 1500." It was a campaign of fire and sword. This "smart little army" made a desert out of the country through which it passed, seizing property of every description, burning towns and hanging disloyalists. Lane concluded one of his dispatches with the detached, incidental observation, "I have offered a reward of $1000 for the head of Matthews," an observation quite as suggestive and significant as the more formal part of the report. His name became a terror on the border. In 1862 a band of seventy-five negroes marched unmolested from southern Kansas to the Arkansas line and liberated some of their friends. A scout rode in advance of the main body, and if he discovered any suspicious-looking men about, it was only necessary for him to dash up to them shouting "Jim Lane, Jim Lane is coming!"—they fled in a panic.

The effect of this savage warfare upon Lane's "smart little army" was deplorable. After a few weeks of service the author of the "Miles O'Reilly" papers, then assistant adjutant-general at Fort Leavenworth, reported them as utterly demoralized—"a mere ragged, half-armed, mutinous rabble, taking votes as to whether any troublesome order should be obeyed or defied." On the 8th of October Lane undertook the defense of his marauders in a speech at Leavenworth. "Two months ago," he said, "the Kansas brigade was organized. I was put at the head of it with the respect, the confidence, aye, the love of every man in that command. . . . What is the charge which the creatures at the Fort make against the Kansas brigade? We are Jay-hawkers. . . . When you march through a state you must destroy the property of the men in arms against it—destroy, devastate, desolate. . . . I ask you to stand between me and the vile traitors and slanderers in the rear. . . . Why, my soldiers would follow me right into the middle of hell!"

Lane was anxious for further military service and at once set about the organization of "an active winter's campaign" in western Missouri and Arkansas, of which he should be the leader. Nobody outside of Washington was consulted. General Hunter complained that "the Kansas senator would seem to have effectually 'jay-hawked'" all knowledge or remembrance of him out of the minds of the authorities. The doughty old veteran, however, concluded to stand upon his rights and to lead in person any "Great Southern Expedition" that might be undertaken. His decision killed the scheme and the originator of it returned to Washington in an unhappy state of mind.

General Hunter vetoed one military enterprise upon which the Kansas senator had set his heart and General Schofield vetoed another. In August, 1863, Quantrill and his bushrangers, who destroyed Lawrence and butchered one hundred and eighty of the inhabitants, barely missed including Lane among the victims. As they escaped with little loss, he elaborated a plan of retaliation, which he believed would meet the necessities of the case. It was proposed that the entire male population of Kansas should assemble at Paola on the eighth day of October, equipped for a campaign of fifteen days; that this armed horde should be turned loose upon western Missouri to exact such satisfaction as might seem good in their sight. The commander of the department did not approve of the contemplated expedition, and gave the projectors of it to understand that he would interpose if it were attempted. A dispatch, which Lane sent Mr. Lincoln, August 26, 1863, does not leave any doubt whatever in regard to his opinion of this intermeddling commander—"the imbecility and incapacity of Schofield is most deplorable."[1] It turned out that General Schofield was able to deal successfully with the Paola emergency. When the eighth day of October dawned, a small fraction only of the citizens of Kansas assembled in that town, and they contented themselves with speeches and resolutions.

The next year General Sterling Price attempted a counter-invasion from Missouri. Lane joined the staff of the Federal commander and served seventeen days. It was his last appearance in the field, and his energy, his enthusiasm and knowledge of the country appear to have contributed materially to the success of the operations by which "an insolent and hopeful foe . . . was met, checked, beaten back and finally put to rout." But, when every claim which can be fairly made in Lane's behalf has been allowed, there is no escape from the conclusion that Mr. Lincoln made a serious mistake in commissioning him as brigadier-general of volunteers and dispatching him to Kansas. General Halleck thought that the appointment was putting "a premium on robbery and rascality." His view of the case came nearer the truth than Mr. Lincoln's.[1]

---

[1] "I have not the 'capacity' to see the wisdom or justice of permitting an irresponsible mob to enter Missouri for the purpose of retaliation." Schofield, *Forty-six Years in the Army*, p. 79.

If Lane won few laurels in the field, he did gain distinction as Commissioner of Recruiting. August 4, 1862, he opened an office at Leavenworth to raise and equip negro soldiers. "I had the honor," he said in the Senate, January 4, 1864, and he repeated the statement on other occasions, "I had the honor of organizing the first regiment of colored soldiers in this war." He may not have been entirely justified in making this unqualified claim, since General Hunter, who balked his "Great Southern Expedition" so effectually, began to arm negroes in South Carolina during the month of May, 1862. Hunter's experiment did not have much immediate success. The blacks, alarmed by various sensational rumors, hesitated to enlist. A draft, which was ordered, did not help matters and the regiment finally disbanded, with the exception of a single company. That became the nucleus of a new organization, which General Saxton reported, November 12, 1862, to be "filling up rapidly—550 are already enrolled." A portion of this regiment was mustered into service November 7. Lane's colored troops experienced no vicissitudes of disbandment and reorganization. He raised them "by one swoop—just by sending out patrols, the men were brought right in." The hostility of the community gave him more trouble than anything else. "On account of the prejudice of the public against the first colored regiment," he said, "I was compelled to keep it out of sight and drill it in a retired place." This regiment was not mustered into service until January 12, 1863, though, meanwhile, it "fought, drilled and labored," losing "a great many men by battle and disease."

Lane was a pro-slavery Democrat when he came to Kansas in 1855. Two years in the territory effected a great change in his sentiments. "I will never cease my efforts," he said in a speech at Topeka in 1857, "until from the Yellowstone in the North to the Gulf in the South, one line of free states shall be reared, an impenetratable barrier against which the cursed waves of slavery shall dash themselves in vain. Until that time comes I am a crusader for Freedom." Soon after his arrival in Washington he began to speak of himself as "a radical and abolitionist." In 1861 he declared that if slavery shall perish thereby, "we will thank God that He has brought upon us this war." At a later period, when the subject was before Congress, he contended that colored troops ought to have all the rights and privileges of their white comrades. Let there be no discrimination, he urged, "between the soldiers . . . who mingle their blood in the same great cause."

---

[1] "It was very difficult for me to comprehend the political necessity which compelled Mr. Lincoln to give his official countenance to such men as Lane and Blunt in Kansas." Schofield, *Forty-six Years in the Army*, p. 111.

Yet Lane advocated colonization. His most elaborate speech in Congress was devoted to a statement and defense of this policy. It seemed to him in 1861 that South America ought to be given up to the negro. "Sir, I want to see," he said in the Senate, July 18, "so soon as it can be done constitutionally these two races separated, an ocean rolling between them; that—South America—the elysium of the colored man; this the elysium of the white."

In 1864 Lane revived the scheme with some modifications. He believed that the black man could not hold his own against "the grasping cupidity" of the whites in a northern climate. We ought, therefore, he argued, to place him in a position where he can take care of himself and that will be possible only in the South. What section of it shall be dedicated to the experiment? "Some of us would be glad," he said, "to set aside South Carolina . . . as the future home of the colored man. I have frequently gone so far myself as to say that I hoped the time would come when the footprint of the white man should not be found on the soil of South Carolina." But serious objections to that locality would remain even if we should "slay all the male traitors" in it. There is, however, an available section, free from any of the difficulties which would embarrass the enterprise in South Carolina—the territory of the Rio Grande. In situation, in fertility and extent it is all that could be desired. When this territory shall be thrown open to their exclusive use, colored men will be attracted to it from Canada to the Gulf. Emigrants, crowding all the avenues of approach will hasten thither "in every kind of a vehicle from a wheel-barrow to a mail-coach. . . . Thus that question which has disturbed the peace of the nation during my entire life will be fully settled."

If Mr. Lincoln conferred upon Lane powers such as no other senator either possessed or desired, the latter was able to make substantial returns for the unprecedented favors which he had received. These returns were mainly in the line of campaign oratory. As one might have anticipated, the Senate did not prove to be a favorable arena for Lane's peculiar gifts of speech. He found the atmosphere and traditions of the place a trifle oppressive. The remarkable prophecy of *The Leavenworth Conservative*—we have already quoted this mis-named periodical on Lane's military genius—came short of fulfilment. "When the Sermon on the Mount, preached by the Savior of mankind," the editor of this newspaper wrote, "ceases to be sublime, then will Lane . . . cease to be as eloquent as finite beings can be!" In the Senate his eloquence did practically cease. On one or two occasions he broke through the restraints of the place and spoke in his natural vein. "Old Jim thinks he's at Baldwin City," was the comment of a Kansan in the gallery. His latest oratorical triumphs were won, not in the Senate, but in the political campaign which preceded Mr. Lincoln's renomination. As Mr. Lincoln's first term drew to a close it became evident that a formidable opposition must be reckoned with in the Republican party. Men like Henry Winter Davis, Thaddeus Stevens and Benjamin F. Wade were out of sympathy with his policy and methods. Editors of influential newspapers, notably Mr. Greeley of *The New York Tribune*, made no secret of their disaffection. So early as the 10th of March, 1864, Lane announced that Mr. Lincoln was "the consistent, stern and proper leader" of the loyal party. He was selected, by the President himself it is said, to open the campaign in the city of New York and spoke on the thirtieth of March in Cooper Institute before the Union Lincoln Club. He began by referring to his own change of political views. "I was born and reared a Democrat," he remarked, "and Oh! what a thing to say before God—taught to believe that slavery was a divine institution." He told the story of his conversion, the story to which the Missourians listened with interest at Nebraska City in 1856. Then he passed to consider the gravity of the present crisis, urging that "the battle to be fought with ballots in November is as important as any battle to be fought with bullets during the war." He dwelt upon "the capacity for governing" which Mr. Lincoln "had amply demonstrated," and upon the fact that the selection of any other candidate would give a great shock to public confidence. The meeting concluded with three cheers for the orator and three times three for the President.

On another and more notable occasion Lane undertook a similar commission at the request of Mr. Lincoln. The Grand Council of the Union League met in Baltimore, June 6, 1864, the day before the National Republican Convention assembled. It was understood that a demonstration would be made in the League against the President, but the rancor and violence of it surpassed all expectation. Not a word was said in reply until the storm had spent its fury. Then Lane rose and addressed himself to the task of turning "the tide of passion and excitement in the opposite direction . . . a task worthy of the highest, greatest effort of human oratory. I am no orator at all, but to precisely that task have I now set myself with absolute certainty of success. It is only needful that the true should be set forth plainly now that the false has done its worst." After a rapid survey in which the patience, the magnanimity, the statesmanship of the President were vividly and dramatically portrayed, there followed a quick glance at the great convention about to assemble. "If we nominate any other than Abraham Lincoln," said the orator, "we nominate ruin." His triumph was complete. When he finished the tide of passion and excitement had been turned in the opposite direction!

The question, who shall be the candidate for Vice-President, was also anxiously debated in Republican circles. Mr. Lincoln remained silent. It was generally thought that he favored the selection of a southern Unionist, but nobody appeared to have any definite information upon this point. Lane claimed to have secured the nomination of Andrew Johnson. "I originally selected him," he said, "as the candidate of the Republican party for the second office within the gift of that party. . . . I urged him on the convention at Baltimore." At least three months before the meeting of the convention Lane assured friends in Kansas that he would be nominated.

After the death of Mr. Lincoln, President Johnson and Congress soon parted company over the question of reconstruction. The differences came to an open rupture with the veto of the Civil Rights bill, an extreme, ill-advised measure designed to protect the negroes of the South. Senator Wade of Ohio assailed the President in the most violent language—accused him of attempting to play the part of dictator, despot and traitor; of plotting to bring back the rebels into congress "for the utter destruction of the government." In this contest Lane broke away from the radicals with whom he had fraternized and undertook the defense of the President. He denounced Wade's speech as "one of the most vindictive assaults ever made upon a public official, . . . an assault upon my personal friend . . . whom I learned to respect and admire for his pluck, his ability and integrity, and to love for his manly virtues." Wade intimated that Lane was wearing the collar of the President of the

United States, a suggestion which he indignantly repelled. "I wear a collar! The pro-slavery party of the United States backed by a Democratic administration, sustained and supported by the army, could not fasten a collar upon the handful of Kansas squatters of whom I had the honor to be the leader. . . : I wear a collar! Indicted for treason by a pro-slavery grand jury, hunted from state to state by a writ founded upon that indictment and $100,000 offered for my head! Jim Lane wear a collar! Wherever he is known that charge will be denounced as false by both friends and enemies."

A fatal despondency succeeded this belligerent mood. Lane had been involved in some doubtful transactions connected with the management of Indian affairs. Angered by his desertion, the Republican senators proposed to investigate them. If charges were formulated and pressed, expulsion from the Senate might follow, and in that event a re-election would be impossible. The future seemed an outlook into despair. "I would give all I possess," he said, "if the mistake were undone." But had Lane made a mistake in his defense of President Johnson? Certainly not unless we measure his conduct by the standards of a blind partisanship. The scheme of reconstruction which he advocated was preferable to the rough-shod programme of the radicals. It is a curious illustration of the perversities of fate that some tardy, fitful blossoming of statesmanship should have proved an occasion of ruin to a man whose follies and sins had been so ample. But such was the case, and Lane, unable to find a better solution, cut the knot of his perplexities by suicide.

Little remains to be said in the way of epilogue to this wild biography. The personal magnetism of Lane, his enormous energy, his remarkable gifts of stump-oratory, and his impulsive patriotism, were accompanied by qualities of rashness, demagogism and moral obliquity, which made him, in spite of all that belongs to his credit, and the sum of it is not inconsiderable, a dangerous man.

LEVERETT W. SPRING.

DOCUMENTS

1. *Thomas Shepard to Hugh Peter, 1645.*

For the following letter, written by Rev. Thomas Shepard, minister at Cambridge, Massachusetts, the readers of the Review are indebted to Charles H. Firth, Esq., of the University of Oxford. The first part of it may be compared with Shepard's letter to another fellow-clergyman in England, published this same year under the title *New England's Lamentation for Old England's Errours*, His interest in the library of Harvard College is well known. Parliament had in the previous year given to Peter the library of Archbishop Laud, or, according to Peter, a small part of it (*Lords' Journals*, VIII. 582; *Last Legacy*, p. 104).

In collecting materials for the life of Hugh Peter which I contributed to the *Dictionary of National Biography*, I met with the following letter to Peter which seems likely to interest American readers. It does not appear to have been published, at least I have not met with it in print. The original is amongst Clarendon's Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library. See *Calendar of the Clarendon Manuscripts*, I. 292.

C. H. Firth.

My good brother Peters,

I hartily thanke you for your letter; we do greatly rejoyce to heare how greatly instrumentall God makes you; and that he keepes you spotles and blameles in your course notwithstanding the reproaches of some. I have ever thought that it was a divine hand that sent you from us for a time, and therefore till your worke be done in England I would not have you to returne to New, tho' I am one of those many who earnestly long to see you once agayne: be very watchfull for I feare nothing but some sudden stab, or some Jesuit neare you in some honest mans forme. Your child[1] is very well with us what ever reports may come to you to the contrary, and her education is not neglected. You seeme to thinke a letter I writ (but never thought it would have bin made publike) to be too sharpe, and that honest men who are for Christ should be suffred tho' they run out into opinions. I desire to shew the utmost forbearance to godly men if for a time deluded; but otherwise I see no more reason to beare with good men in their opinions then in their morall transgressions, for they commonly are coupled together: you have had experience of the gangreene in New England, and have seene it spread in a little time, and how God hath borne witnesse agaynst that generation. I feare greater sorrowes attend England if they do not seasonably suppresse and beare publike witnesse agaynst such delusions which fill the land like locusts without any king, and will certainly (if suffred) eat up the greene grasse of the land. I know there may be some connivance for a time while 'tis tumultuous and while the wars call all spirits thither; but toleration of all upon pretence of conscience I thanke God my soule abhors it: the godly in former times never fought for the liberty of there consciences by pleading for liberty for all, but they bare witnesse to the truth with glorious and boldnes and if they would not receive there testimony, they desired to kisse the flames and fill the prisons, and suffer to the utmost, as knowing that suffrings for the truth, were more advantagious to the promoting of it then there own peace and safety with liberty for all errour. I know the case may be such as a state may tolerate all, because of necessity they must, the numbers are so many and the hazard more; but its one thinge to be under such a misery, another thing what is mens' duty out of such a desperate case: let me be bold (my deare brother) to perswade you to be watchfull over your selfe, least your hart herein out of love to some men growes cold to God's truth: there is but one truth (you know) and it is [*is it*] not your dayly prayer to God to blot out all errours beside from off this earth and from under these heavens, and can your spirit then close with such or beare with such evills in your ministry or judgement, which your hart in secret prayer is dayly agaynst, is it not high time for all God's ministers to awaken and purge God's floure of such chaff which lies uppermost and is growen so active and witty to deceive in these evill times: I know the honesty of the hart of brother Peters cannot beare with it, but he will take to him the zeale of his God, and do worthily herein: excuse me if I transgresse, my errour is of love; I write nothing to greeve you my desire is the God of all grace may fill you with a spirit of might, light, and glory, and still preserve and every way enlarge you for the good of Sion.

---

[1] Elizabeth, born 1640, the only child, to whom Peter addressed his *Last Legacy*.

You should do very well to helpe our Colledge with a more compleat Library, we have very good wits among us and they grow up mightily, but we want bookes; be intreated earnestly to helpe us herein speedily, God will certainly recompence that part of your care, into your bosom: we want schoolmen especially; helpe herein, devise some way to furnish us, we were thinking to desire the A^{rch}Bishop's Library, and that the Parlament would recompence your labours for publike good with somewhat more usefull for your self, if you could bring about some such thing, or any other way helpe us, you could not but be remembred of us: forget us not we intreat you, and doe something in speciall for the

2 children of Dr. Ames,[1] who are now fatherles and motherles, William (who is now Sir Ames)[2] a fruit of your ministry, is one of the hopefullest yong men that I know, and of a very gracious spirit. I beseech you send over some cloth or some such thing to them for there father's sake you know the wants of the cuntry otherwise: but I hold you too long from your worke by these lines, let me be had in your remembrance and prayers we shall never forget you. with many hearty remembrances to you I rest

Your unworthy brother
THO: SHEPARD.

Cambridge
Dec. 27, 1645.
[*Endorsed:*] To Hugh Peters,
Dec. 27, 1645.
[*Addressed:*] To the Reverend his
deare brother Mr. Peters
minister of Christ every where,
be these
&c. &c.

2. *The Illinois Indians to Captain Abner Prior, 1794.*

For the following letters we are indebted to Dr. N. P. Dandridge of Cincinnati. They were found in a collection of papers belonging to his grandfather, N. G. Pendleton, and great-grandfather, Jesse (or Jessie) Hunt. Hunt was a sutler and contractor with Wayne's army, and the papers probably were preserved by him. They illustrate the relations between the Illinois (or Kaskaskia) Indians and the United States agents in the interval between St. Clair's defeat (1791) and Wayne's victory (August 20, 1794). The officer to whom all three letters are addressed, Captain Abner Prior of the third sub-legion of the United States Infantry (d. 1800), is mentioned as of distinguished bravery, in Wayne's despatch of August 28, 1794 (*American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, I. 491.) Jean Baptiste De Coigne or Ducoigne, the writer of the first letter, was a chief of the Kaskaskias. In the Jefferson correspondence (*Bulletin of the Bureau of Rolls and Library*, No. 6, p. 91), we find Jefferson writing to him in 1781, urging him to preserve the peace. Again in 1796 (*ibid.*) Jefferson writes him a

---

[1] Dr. William Ames, the celebrated theologian, professor at Franeker. At the time of his death, 1633, he was associated with Peter at Rotterdam. "Learned Amesius breathed his last breath into my bosom. . . . . He was my colleague." Peter, *Last Report*, p. 14.

[2] William Ames the younger came to New England in 1637 with his mother, a brother John and an older sister Ruth. His mother died at Cambridge in December, 1644. He was graduated at Harvard College in 1645, and, returning to England, became minister at Wrentham. He was ejected in 1662 and died in 1689.

letter introducing Volney. In 1803 he was one of the signers to Harrison's treaties with the Kaskaskias, concluded at Vincennes (Bioren and Duane's *U. S. Laws*, I. 387, 408).

I. DE COIGNE TO PRIOR.

A Mr Praieur Des Kaskakias ce 10 Mars 1794

Monsieur

Je vous écrit la présente pour vous informer et vous prier d'informer Mr Le Commandant du Poste[1] que continuellement nous sommes tourmenté par les Kis et les Kikapou, qui viennent de tuer un amériquain. Les Loix ne sont point observé ici l'on ne cesse point de donner de la boisson aux sauvages de sorte que ce Pays ci est comme abbandonné et exposé au plus grand Danger si lon instruit point mon Pere Le Général Washington de tous ces desordres pour qu'il envoye de la troupe pour faire observer les loix et pour répouser les ennemis. Je ne suis pas assez en force pour faire face à ces deux Nations par ce que la milice de cette Contrée n'est point en vigueur.

Les Chicachas et les Chacta viennent en Guerre contre les Illinois et contre les Pé et l'on craint que dici a un mois il sortent plus de cinq cent.

Quant aux sauvages d'en haut du Mississipy tel que les Sacs les Pakoakimina et autres nations ils sont tous amis et veulent faire une une bonne paix avec les Amériquains avec moi je les attends d'ici a vingt jours. Les Sacs et les Pakoakimina m'ont apporté il y a un mois la Porceline pour faire la paix, je leur ais envoyé un Pavillon et un baril de Wisky, ils doivent venir cent hommes pour me parler.

Les Kis et les Kikapou disent au sujet de leurs freres qui sont morts de la picote que c'est moi qui les ait fait tuer et empoisonner par les Amériquains et pour se vanger il ont dit qu'il me tueroit. Depuis que je suis arrivé j'ai toujours été occupé a éloigner les ennemis mais je ne suis aidé de personne.

Je vous prie, Monsieur, de m'envoyer du secours et de me faire réponse par les personnes qui conduisent Mr Flaget (?). Je fais mes sinceres complimens à à Mr Le Commandant et à tous les officiers et à nos bons amis les Amériquains et je je suis avec une parfaite considération,

Monsieur

Votre tres humble
et obeissant serviteur
Prieur pour Jean Baptiste
De Coigne chef des
Illinois

Le petit Prieur de
Gallipolis assure de ses
Civilités à son grand
frere Praieur

(*Addressed:*)

A Monsieur
Monsieur Praieur
Capitaine
au Poste Vincenne

---

[1] Lieutenant-Colonel J. F. Hamtramck, probably.

II. DUQUETIL (?) TO PRIOR.

Monsieur,

Je prens la liberté de vous adresser la présente, autant pour vous assurer de mes Très humbles respects, que pour vous prouver que j'ai fais mes efforts pour répondre à La confiance dont vous m'avez honoré.

J'ai présenté vôtre parole à la pate de dinde, qui craignant, avec raison, la jalousie de ses gens, n'à pas voulu la recevoir seul, j'ai approuvé son opinion qui m'à paru mieux tendre à la Tranquillité généralle de la riviére des ilinois. Je lui ai cependant représenté, que n'étant point chef, et seulement son Traiteur, je ne pouvois prendre sur moy de former un grand conseil. mais vous ayant promis de faire ce que la prudence m'inspiroit de plus à propos, j'ai cru devoir ceder à ses raisons que j'ai trouvé Bonnes.

J'ai donc consenti à ce que L'assemblée fut plus nombreuse, et conséquament à une augmentation de dépences. quand à ce dernier objet, ou j'ai pris sur moy de passer vos ordres, je vous prie d'en agir, comme Bon vous semblera. je vous assure même, que j'ai été Bien dédommagé par le plaisir de vous être utile, et celui que j'ai gouté à leur dire amplement leurs vérités.

J'espère que vous verrez avec plaisir, leur réponse que je vous envoie. La teneur de cette réponse me surprend moi même, surtout dans une circonstance, où ils peuvent recevoir continuellement des présents considérables. J'admire qu avec si peu de choses, que je leur ai doné, ils vous répondent si favorablement.

Enfin, Monsieur, sans prendre la liberté de vous doner des conseils, je trouve qu'en égard à la disposition présente des sauvages, et aux discours que j'entends tous les jours, il seroit à propós de leur envoyer un peu de poudre et quelques autres objets qui leur paroissent un peu importants. La circonstance me semble excellente pour les attirer.

Je vous repete que la pate de dinde m'à surpris par son zéle et sa générosité. il à doné libéralement Tout ce qu'il à reçu de vous, et l'à partagé de maniére à encourager les autres à se comporter Tous en vôtre faveur.

Mons^{r} Vigo[1] m'ayant doné ordre de recevoir aux Kaskaskias dix galons de Wiski; je l'ai présenté a mad^{me} Tourangeau, qui n'en avoit point dans ce temps. J'ai été contraint en conséquence de fournir moi même quarante Bouteilles de Tafias.

quelques chefs osaukis, ayants eu connoissance du conseil que j'ai tenu dans la riviere des illinois, ont conjecturé, que j'avois plus de pouvoir de vôtre part. ils sont venus vous offrir leur main et leur cœur, protestants qu'ils n'avoient jamais commis d'hostilité contre les grands coutteaux.

Je n'avois rien à leur répondre et je les ai renvoyé, en leur promettant que si je recevoi vos ordres à leur sujet, je les leur communiquerois à mon retour chez eux.

---

[1] Francis Vigo (born in Sardinia about 1740, d. 1836), formerly a great fur-trader at St. Louis, who gave valuable aid to George Rogers Clark in 1778, was now living at Vincennes, and was major commandant of the militia there (*House Report 122*, Twenty-third Congress, Second Session, pp. 15,19; Dillon, *History of Indiana*, p. 237).

Je Suis, Monsieur,

Vôtre Très humble
et Très obéissnt Serviteur
FRANC ÇOIS DUQUETIL (?)

Kahokias 10 mars
1794

(*Addressed:*) Au Capine Prayer
député du Surintendant pour Le
departement Sauvage
au Fort Knox[1]

III. THE ILLINOIS TO PRIOR.

Réponse des chefs sauvages dans la riviére des ilinois, à la harangue que je leur ai faite.

Mon pere,

nous avons reçu Ta parole, qui nous à Tous satisfait. nous jugeons cependant, par elle, que tu crois avoir ici peu d'enfants. crois, mon pere, que Tous les mascoutins et kicapous le sont avec plaisir depuis qu'ils ont succé ton lait. ils en ont gouté peu, mais ils l'ont trouvé Bon. nous te prions, (si tu es une autre fois disposé à nous faire charité), de la proportioner à nôtre nombre.

quelques uns de nos gens, mon pere, ont été te voir. nous ne scavons ce qu'ils ont été faire, ne nous ayants pas encore parlé.

nous sommes contents que le Tailleur nous ait assemblé, pour entendre Ta parole. comme nous la trouvons Bonne et propre à exciter le Bien, nous y repondons à cœur ouvert.

Viens, mon pere, quand tu voudras, demeurer sur des terres qui sont à toi, comme à nous. nous ne pouvons, ni te les doner, ni te les vendre, ne les ayants pas faites nous mêmes. c'est le maitre de la vie, qui les à faites pour toi, comme pour nous. nous esperons donc que Tu viendras, et nous désirons de te voir, et de vivre paisiblement ensemble.

Tu nous dis que nous sommes fous, en ce que quelques uns de nos jeuns gens, étourdis, vont lever des chevelures francoises où grands couteaux, voler des cheveaux.

cela est vrai, mon pere; mais nous ne sommes pas fous en corps; ce n'est que quelques jeunes gens, dequi Ta présence gagneroit les cœurs; c'est pourquoi, nous te désirons ardemment.

nous nous flattons que Tu auras plus d'esprit que les anglois n'en ont eu dans la derniére guerre. ils nous ont levé, et tous nos morts sont encore sans couvertures. nous pensons que Tu auras plus d'esprit. prends courrage, mon pere, dans ta parole.

---

[1] *I. e.*, Vincennes.

Tu nous annonce que Tu donnes la main au françois.[1] Tu n'ignores pas, Mon pere, que nos encêtres après L'avoir rencontré, n'ont pas souffert qu'il marche par terre; ils l'ont porté sur des robes. tu nous assure qu'il est ton frere, et cette parole suffit pour achever de te doner entierrement nos cœurs.

ne crains rien, mon pere, puisque Tu as le coeur assez fort pour pardoner ce que nos fous ton fait. tu leur fais charité; et ils auront assez d'esprit pour se mieux comporter, et les viellards les veilleront de près.

nous désirons tous de te voir, pour te communiquer nos pensées. nous étions deux disposés a suivre le Tailleur, qui nous à répondu qu'il n'avoit pas d'ordre pour cela. Si tu as le même désire que nous, commande lui de nous mener, nous serons toujours prets.

Tu nous dis que Bien des mauvais oiseaux rodent sur notre riviére, de n'écouter aucune des mauvaises chansons qui se chantent, et de rester tranquilles. c'est à quoi nous travaillons, mon pere; les chefs, les viellards et les considérés s'occuppent continuellement à faire enterrer le casse-tête des jeunes gens. ainsi nous sommes déterminés a te regarder agir, jusqu'à ceque Tu nous ordonne quelque chose.

nous ne pouvons rien te dire de plus, n'ayants pas assez d'esprit. nous sçavons mieux penser que discourir.

Je ne suis pas chef, mon pere, mais c'est avec leur approbation et en leur présence que je te parle. ce sont mes chefs qui m'engagent à parler pour eux, aux quels je me joins pour te doner Tous ensemble, la main.

harangueur	La Pate de Dinde.
chef	Coudgiache.
chef	*Michikitenon, frere de lagesse.[2]
chef	L'Étourneau, chef du petit fort West du lac michigan.

*Michikitenon est le frere de lagesse mort dans les colonies.

3. South Carolina in the Presidential Election of 1800.

When the Sixth Congress assembled for its second session, November 17, 1800, the general impression at Washington was that the result of the presidential canvass then in progress depended on the action of South Carolina, especially since the triumph of the Republicans in New York and the *impasse* in Pennsylvania. In the end, as is well known, the process of election resolved itself into two decisions. First, it was decided by the electoral votes that the next president should be one of the Republican candidates; secondly, the House of Representatives chose Jefferson rather than Burr. It may fairly be said that the election in South Carolina was the turning-point in the first of these decisions. Its critical importance will, it is thought, lend interest to the following letters, addressed to Jefferson and Madison, and written, with one exception, by the chief leader of their party in South Carolina. The texts are derived from the originals in the Bureau of Rolls and Library in the Department of State at Washington, by the kindness of Mr. S. M. Hamilton.

---

[1] If this be true, it would appear that Prior had been unduly influenced by the proclamation of George Rogers Clark, calling for volunteers for his Louisiana expedition, printed in the *Centinel of the Northwestern Territory* of January 25, 1794, and had not duly regarded St. Clair's proclamation of December 7, 1795, against the expedition. *St. Clair Papers*, II. 321.

[2] Lagesse was the principal chief of the Pottawatomies. A speech of his to Hamtramck, delivered in the summer of 1792, is in *American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, I. 241.

Charles Pinckney (1758–1824), the writer of most of these letters, was the son of a first cousin of the brothers General Charles Cotesworth Pinckney and Major Thomas Pinckney. With the former, he had been a member of the Philadelphia Convention of 1787. He had been governor of South Carolina from 1789 to 1792, and from 1796 to 1798. Since 1798 he had been a member of the United States Senate from South Carolina. By the services which he describes in the following letters he entitled himself to the Spanish mission, which he held from 1802 to 1806. The administration ultimately lost confidence in him (*Writings of Gallatin*, I. 391).

Beside what they reveal to us of the general aspects of Carolina politics at the turn of the century (an interesting field only partially explored) and the curious personality of Charles Pinckney, these letters, especially that which is here numbered IX., cast light on the attempt to poll the votes of South Carolina for Jefferson and C. C. Pinckney. If her votes had been so cast, the former, it is now seen, would have been elected president, the latter vice-president. The managers of the Federal caucus at Philadelphia had foreseen such a possibility, or that of Pinckney's winning the first place, when they put him in nomination. Thus, Sedgwick, in a letter to King, dated Stockbridge, September 26, 1800 (*Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, III. 309), says: "At the time we agreed on Mr. Pinckney as a candidate, which was at a meeting of the whole federal party in Congress, we had every assurance which could be given by the members from S. Carolina, that whatever might be the character of their electors, such was the popularity of General Pinckney, that all the votes of that state would be given to him—if federal, of course for Adams and Pinckney, if antifederal, for Pinckney and Jefferson." Proposals looking to a vote for Pinckney and Jefferson were evidently made to the former at Columbia. Alexander Garden, in his *Eulogy on Gen. Chs. Cotesworth Pinckney*, p. 35, says, "It is a fact well understood, that . . General C. C. Pinckney, by consenting to unite his name with that of Mr. Jefferson, would have secured to himself the unanimous vote of the Electors of South Carolina as Vice-President;" and he relates Pinckney's refusal. See also the letters of Gadsden to Adams and of Adams to Gadsden in Adams's *Life and Writings*, IX. 579, 584, and of Troup to King, in the latter's *Life and Correspondence*, III. 340. The Rev. Dr. C. C. Pinckney, in his *Life of General Thomas Pinckney*, pp. 155–157, fortifies the story with the authority of Justice Johnson and with that of Chancellor De Saussure, who, he says, was "a member of the committee sent by the members of the legislature to confer with General Pinckney." The statements made by Charles Pinckney (p. 127, *post*), seem to preclude the notion that the overtures to his cousin were made by the majority of the Republicans. The legislature numbered 161, with ten absentees. Upon the average, there were 85 for the Republican candidates to 66 for the Federalists. Even though 70 of the former were uncompromising in party loyalty, the other fifteen were enough to hold the balance. The committee which proposed the fusion must apparently have represented these, and certain of the Federal party, to which latter De Saussure belonged.

The biographer of Thomas Pinckney quotes De Saussure as relating that a committee, of which he was a member, twice made overtures, of the kind described, to General Pinckney. With this it happens to be possible to compare De Saussure's contemporary account of the transaction. In a letter written from Columbia on December 2, 1800, to John Rutledge in Washington, De Saussure said: "We could easily have formed a ticket, which would have been elected by a great majority, for the election of Mr. Jefferson and Gen. Pinckney. But on the most mature deliberation, we deemed it wisest and most honorable to adhere to the federal arrangements, for the equal support of Mr. Adams and Gen. Pinckney. Gen. Pinckney firmly resisted any inducement to be associated with Mr. Jefferson, at the expence of Mr. Adams." This quotation is given in the *Providence Journal* of December 24, 1800, in the course of an anonymous communication from Washington (really written by Senator Theodore Foster to Nicholas Brown).

I. CHARLES PINCKNEY TO JEFFERSON.[1]

October 12 : 1800

Dear Sir,

I have written you very often lately but have never yet had the pleasure of a line from you, or known whether you have received my Letters. indeed from the manner in which a Letter from M^r^ Nicholas came to me after being opened, I have every reason to believe very few if any of my friends Letters reach me, or those I write, the Gentlemen to whom they are Addressed. I wish to know how things will go, in Maryland and Pennsylvania and Delaware and Jersey. the influence of the officers of the Government and of the Banks and of the British and Mercantile Interest will be very powerful in Charleston. I think we shall in the City as Usual; loose ⅔^{ds} of the representation, but the City has generally not much influence at Columbia. our Country Republican Interest has always been very strong, and I have no doubt will be so now. I have done every thing to strengthen it and mean to go to Columbia to be at the Election of Electors. the *24* numbers of *the Republican*[1] which I have written have been sent on to you, and I trust you have received and approved them. they are written in much moderation and have been circulated as much as possible. so has the *little Republican Farmer* I shewed you in Philadelphia and which has been reprinted in all our *Southern States.*[2] with these and my Speeches on Juries, Judges, Ross' Bill the Intercourse Bill and the Liberty of the Press,[3] we have Literally sprinkled Georgia and Nº Carolina *from the Mountains to the Ocean.* Georgia will be *Unanimous,* North Carolina 8 or 9,[4] Tennessee Unanimous, and I am hopefull we shall also. I suppose you must have got the Volume of my Speeches. one was sent you by Post and another by Water Via Philadelphia. I have done every thing that was possible here and have been obliged *alone* to take the whole abuse of the Parties United against us. they single me out, as the object. my situation is difficult and delicate, but I push Straight on in those principles which I have always pursued, and in which I would persevere if there were but *ten Men* left who continued to think with me

---

[1] Jefferson Papers, Department of State, Ser. 2, Vol. 66, No. 65. Endorsed by Jefferson: "Pinckney Charles. Oct. 26, 1800. rec^d^ Nov. 24."

October 16.— 1800

Since the within written we have had the election for Charleston, which by dint of the Bank and federal Interest, is reported by the Managers to be against us 11 to 4—that is the federalists are reported to have 11 out of 15 the number for the City representation.[5] many of our Members run within 28 and 30 and 40 and we think we get *four* in—I believe 5. to shew you what has been the Contest and the abuse I have been obliged to Bear, I inclose you some of the last days Publications. I suppose this unexpected opposition to *my Kinsman* who has never been opposed here before as *member for the City,* will sever and divide me from him and his Brother forever,[6] for the federalists all charge me with being the *sole cause* of any opposition, in this State, where all our intelgence from the Country convinces me, we shall have a *decided majority* in our Legislature. besides we mean to dispute the Election of Charleston on the ground that many have Voted who had no right and are not Citizens—I am told 200—and that a Scrutiny is to be demanded. you may be assured that I have since June labored as much as I was able,—so will I continue if my health is spared, which I trust it will, to exert myself to the Utmost, and have little doubt of succeeding. I long to hear from the Northern States. No doubt Pennsylvania will vote and do right, and Jersey—; so Genl. Mason[1] writes me. being lame from a recent Accident to my arm obliges me to write at intervals. I left of Yesterday and now resume my pen. since this our Accounts from the Country are still more favorable, I expect to morrow to hear further and more favorably. I never before this knew the full extent of the federal Interest connected with the British and the aid of the Banks and the federal Treasury, and all their officers. they have endeavored to Shake *Republicanism in South Carolina* to its foundations, but we have resisted it firmly and I trust successfully. our Country Interest out of the reach of Banks and Custom Houses and federal officers is I think as pure as ever. I rejoice our Legislature meets 130 or 40 Miles from the Sea. As much as I have been accustomed to Politics and to Study mankind this Election in Charleston has opened to me a new view of things. never certainly was such an Election in America. we mean to contest it for 8 or 9 of the 15. it is said several Hundred more Voted than paid taxes. *the Lame, Crippled, diseased and blind were either led, lifted or brought in Carriages to the Poll.* the sacred right of Ballot was struck at, for at a late hour, when too late to counteract it, in order to know how men, who were supposed to be under the influence of Banks and federal officers and English Merchants, Voted, and that they might be Watched to know whether they Voted as they were directed, the Novel and Unwarrantable measure was used of Voting with tickets printed *on Green and blue and red and yellow paper* and Men stationed to watch the Votes. The Contest lasted several days and Nights and will be brought before the House. in the Mean time I am charged with being the Whole and *sole cause* and so much abuse and public and private Slander, I believe no man has ever yet sustained. on *some false private Charges* I have been obliged to come forward and deny them, and whenever it may be in their power, the British and federal Interest will consider it not only *as Meritorious*, but even as *a duty* to persecute me.

---

[1] Doubtless contributed to a Charleston newspaper. They are mentioned by O'Neall, *Bench and Bar,* I. 141, but seem never to have been collected in a volume; but see *post,* p. 124.

[2] It may be conjectured that this refers to *Three Letters, Written, and Originally Published, under the Signature of a South Carolina Planter, . . . by Charles Pinckney* . . . Philadelphia, "Aurora" Office, 1799; reprinted, with some changes of title and contents, at Charleston the same year.

[3] *Speeches of Charles Pinckney, Esq. in Congress. . . .* Printed in 1800. Pp. 135.

[4] The actual number proved to be 8 for Jefferson and Burr, 4 for Adams and Pinckney.

[5] By the Constitution of 1790 Charleston had 15 representatives out of 124.

[6] C. C. Pinckney and Thomas Pinckney.

I request to have a line from you saying if you receive this safe. I have kept up a correspondence in North Carolina and Georgia and sent there every thing I could. We hope from North CaroLina 8 and perhaps 9 and I inclose You an Extract from Louisville[2] that says Georgia will be unanimous. I congratulate you most sincerely on the Change in

---

[1] Doubtless Gen. Stevens Thompson Mason, of Virginia, U. S. Senator from 1794 to 1803.

[2] Then the capital of Georgia.

Maryland and the probable one in North CaroLina and Rhode Island. In this State I have no doubt nor ever had.

October 26: 1800—Our accounts respecting our State Legislature are every day more favorable. from those We have heard of We are sure now to have a decided majority and We still have to hear from other counties which have been always republican and which in fact we considered our strong ground. I send this under cover to M^r^ Madison and am hopeful you will get it safe and unbroken, my Letters have many of them come to me open which obliges me to use this precaution [mutilated].

From my going to CoLumbia to be at the Election of Electors and other circumstances it will be late before I can go to Washington this year. besides my arm is not yet so strong as to risque too much with it in travelling and as I go by Land I must go slow, one great object I have in going by Land is to *see you at Monticello,* and my esteemed Friends M^r^ Madison and M^r^ Monroe. I have just got a Letter from M^r^ Dawson[1] confirming from the authority of M^r^ Burr the —— business of Rhode Island.[2] is it possible? can good come out of Galilee?

[No signature.]

II. CHARLES PINCKNEY TO MADISON.[3]

Dear Sir

Permit me to put you to some little Expense and trouble in forwarding the inclosed to our friend at Monticello or wherever he may be when You get it. please send it to him under cover as I wish him much to get it safe. I congratulate You on our very fair prospects at present. We shall do well here. I am hopeful you got my little republican Farmer from Philadelphia, and afterwards from hence the Volume of my Speeches in Congress and since (that is lately) "*the Republican*" in *twenty four numbers* which I have written for this Election. As you see M^r^ Jefferson very often I refer You to him for our political intelligence from hence as I have written him circumstantially of all our movements and prospects here, and in Georgia and North Carolina. I came home in June from Congress with a dislocated right arm, and from that time to the present I have incessantly laboured to carry this Election here and to sprinkle all the southern states with pamphlets and Essays and every thing I thought would promote the common cause against what I well knew must be the Consequence if the federalists succeeded. for this purpose if nothing prevents I go to CoLumbia to be present at the Election of Electors and shall of course be very late at Washington this Year. I am charged with being the *sole cause* of all the Opposition in South CaroLina. *my two Kinsmen* have of course divided and will be seperated from me in future. But regardless of this I persevere in that Line which I believe to be right and from which I have never deviated a tittle since my opposition to the British Treaty, that foundation of all our Evils and Divisions. In consequence I have been obliged to *bear alone the whole* weight of the abuse of the British and federal parties here and so much public and private scandal and rancour I believe no man has Yet borne in the same space. I still however push on and hope by our success that they shall Have something to abuse me for. Please send me a Line to say you receive this. direct to me at CoLumbia in this state. I rejoice to learn as I have just done By Post that MaryLand is returning to her friends and her Duty, and hoping and praying that before I see you in Virginia all things will be as they ought believe me with every sentiment I ought to bear towards a friend I so much value as Yourself—one whom I have not seen so long and who I so long to see my dear sir with affectionate regard

---

[1] Probably John Dawson, M. C. from Virginia 1797–1814.

[2] All four of the Rhode Island electors voted for John Adams, but only three voted for Pinckney, the fourth casting a solitary vote for John Jay. It appears that in the autumn the Republicans had hopes of such a division in the electoral college of that state as would give some votes to their candidates. For a partial explanation of the action taken in Rhode Island, see the contemporary letters in G. C. Mason's *Reminiscences of Newport,* pp. 108–115.

[3] Madison Papers, Department of State, Vol. XXII., p. 36.

Yours Truly
Charles Pinckney
October 26 : 1800
In CharLeston

My best respects to your Lady. You recollect we used often to talk about Matrimony and I have much curiosity to see your Lady. I have heard every thing I could wish of her, for certainly if ever a man deserved a good wife You did. Had You unfortunately got, as Doctor Johnson says, in to a state of Gennococracy (is it right spelt) or petticoat Government I know no man I should have pitied more nor none I could have more sincerely wept over. But as it is, if ever I get into your neighborhood I will go and see you with confidence. have you any little Madisons running about and giving you a feeling which I assert is not otherwise to be found in human nature? the unceasing affection from Penelope to Ulysses or the ardent one from Alcyone to Ceyx was weak and impotent when compared to the affection of a parent (I mean an enlightened and cultivated one, and of principle, not a Beast, as too many are) to a child. I wish you could see my little fellow[1] reading me his Lesson and trying to match some twice his Years, or my little Frances[2] playing at ten Years old a tune and singing to it on the Piano. if you did You would only wonder that politics or any thing else could ever induce me to be so much absent from them. But you know I always loved Politics and I find as I grow older I become more fond of them.

I have just heard that Rhode Island is to give us a Vote or two—is it possible? As I have asked M^r^ Jefferson, speaking of Rhode Island, can good come out of Galilee? I hinted to Dexter[3] that his Office would be a shortlived one, as well as some others, and the Lord of his infinite Mercy grant it.

---

[1] Henry Laurens Pinckney (1794–1863), who founded the *Charleston Mercury* and edited it from 1819 to 1833; M. C. 1833–1837.

[2] Afterward the first wife of Robert Y. Hayne.

[3] Samuel Dexter, Secretary of War, May 13, 1800 to February 3, 1801.

God Bless You

I have had Your Portrait sent me for my Drawing room. It is a Most exact likeness in the face. But makes you about the Body much fatter than when I saw you. if it is so I suppose You have thriven upon Matrimony and find it a good thing

To
James Madison Esquire

[*Addressed:* "To
The Honourable James Madison Junior
To be left at the Post Office
at Orange Court House
"Virginia
"By Post"
Postmarked: "Charl S C
Oct 27".]

III. CHARLES PINCKNEY TO JEFFERSON.[1]

Dear Sir

I have just received your favour after an interval since its date of nearly one Month. I am to particularly regret Your not recieving my communications as I wanted some facts from you to aid me in the very delicate and arduous struggle I have in this state. finding from my intelligence that the Pennsylvania Senate intended to contend for a concurrent vote in the choice of Electors[2] and thus to shield themselves under a pretended affection for the rights of their branch from the popular odium I very early percieved that the choice of a President would in a great measure depend upon this States Vote. I therefore very assiduously have attended to this Object since June and now wait the Issue which is to be decided on on Tuesday next. my anxiety on this subject is very much increased by a Letter I have received from Governour Monroe[3] in answer to one I wrote him on the subject. he seems to think with me that our state must decide it and that Pennsylvania is very uncertain. Since M^r^ Monroe's Letter I have seen *that Woods*[4] is elected President of the Senate of that state. this I think is a bad symptom. he is Ross's[5] Brother in law. it would if it was possible make me redouble my Exertions. I am hopeful we shall succeed and although my situation is truly delicate in being obliged to oppose my own Kinsman, (who does not now on that account speak to me) yet Urged by those principles it is my duty never to forsake and well convinced that the Election depends on this State I have taken post with some valuable friends at CoLumbia where our legislature meet and are now in Session and here I mean to remain until the thing is settled. I am told I am to be personally insulted for being here while I ought to be in Washington and that a Motion will be made expressing the opinion of one of the Branches that all their Members ought to be present at the discussion of the French Treaty. But I who know that the Presidents Election is of more consequence than any Treaty and who feel my presence here to be critically important, mean to remain and my friends with You who know the reason will readily excuse my absence. To weaken the federal Party in our Legislature which is stronger than I ever knew it an attempt is made to set aside the Charleston Election and I have suggested a new idea to the Petitioners which is to suspend the sitting members immediately from their seats. I inclose You a Petition on the subject which at their requests *I have drawn and they are* now debating it. Whether they vote or not I think we shall carry the Election and the Moment it is decided I will write You. my situation here is peculiarly delicate and singular. I am the *only member* of Congress of either side present and the federalists view me with a very jealous Eye. I long to see the Business happily and safely over and to personally pay my respects to You being with great respect and regard

---

[1] Jefferson's Papers, Ser. 2, Vol. 65, Nos. 38 a, 39. Endorsed by Jefferson: "rec^d^ Dec. 12."

[2] In opposition to the proposal, made by the lower branch of the assembly, that the electors should be chosen by joint ballot of the two houses.

[3] James Monroe, Governor of Virginia.

[4] John Wood, speaker of the Senate of Pennsylvania from 1800 to 1802.

[5] James Ross, Federalist, U. S. Senator from 1794 to 1801.

Dear Sir
Yours Truly
CHARLES PINCKNEY

November 22: 1800
In CoLumbia

We have elected 3 republican Members of Congress And a 4th had a narrow Squeeze.

December 2: 1800 The Election is just finished and We Have, Thanks to Heaven's Goodness, carried it. We have Had a hard and arduous struggle and I found that as there Were no hopes from Philadelphia and it depended upon our State entirely to secure Your Election and that it would be almost death to our hopes for me to quit CoLumbia I have remained until it is over and now permit me to congratulate You my dear sir on an Event, which You will find we had an arduous and doubtful struggle to carry and of which I will send You the particulars before I set out. Expect me soon in Washington, but I shall be late, important public arrangements for the republican interest detaining me here a little longer. As to my own Affairs I never think of them. to secure Your Election has employed me, Mind Body and Estate since June.

To
The honourable Thomas Jefferson

I use the same precaution not to superscribe in my own hand. I trust all this precaution will not long be necessary

Post script—
Since writing the within I have some reason to Believe that much unfounded *and pretended friendly information* may be transmitted to promote applications to You and to decieve. I have therefore to request that so far as respects South Carolina, You would be so good as to wait the arrival of a Body of information I am collecting for your use, and intend, if nothing prevents, to Bring with me. When I arrive I will submit it to You merely for your information on such subjects as are interesting to the Republican Interest in the State and your own Superior Judgment will afterwards always best and most safely determine what is right or ought to be done.[1]

[*Addressed:* Free To
"The Honourable Thomas Jefferson
at the Seat of Government of the United States
at Washington
In Maryland
"To go By Post"
Post-marked: "Columbia S. C.
Dec. 2."]

IV. PETER FRENEAU[2] TO JEFFERSON.

Columbia S^{o}. Carolina Dec^{r} 2^{d}. 1800.[3]

Sir

I do myself the honor of informing you that at One oClock this day the election for Electors for President and Vice President of the United States was terminated by the Legislature now sitting in this place. the result is as follows.

Republican		Federal	
John Hunter	87	William Washington	69
Paul Hamilton	87	John Ward	69
Robert Anderson	85	Thomas Roper	67
Theodore Gailliard	85	James Postell	66
Arthur Simkins	84	John Blasingame	66
Wade Hampton	82	John M^{c}Pherson	66
Andrew Love	82	William Falconer	64
Joseph Blyth	82	Henry Dana Ward	63.

The Vote tomorrow I understand will be Thomas Jefferson 8. Aaron Burr 7. Geo Clinton 1.[4] you will easily discover why the one Vote is varied. I take the liberty of giving you this information because M^r^ C. Pinckney is not on the spot. he is at his plantation about five Miles distant[1] and will not be in time for the Post of this day. I know that it is his most earnest wish to give you the earliest information of the result of all our labors.

---

[1] Allusions to Pinckney's recommendations on these subjects may be found in Adams's *Writings of Gallatin*, I. 31, 38.

[2] Peter Freneau (1757–1813), brother of Philip Freneau the poet, secretary of the state of South Carolina, and editor of the *Charleston Gazette*.

[3] Jefferson Papers, Ser. 2, Vol. 34, No. 56. Endorsed by Jefferson: "rec^{d} Dec. 12."

[4] Pickering, writing to King from Easton, December 27 (*Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, III. 352) says, "It is said in one of the newspapers that General Pinckney has written to Mr. Jefferson, that So. Carolina gave 8 votes for him and 7 for Mr. Burr." It is probable that Freneau's letter was the original source of this (mistaken) information,

With the most sincere respect
I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your Most obedient
and Very Hum^l^ Servant,
PETER FRENEAU.

Thomas Jefferson Esq^r^

V. CHARLES PINCKNEY TO JEFFERSON.[2]

Dear Sir

I wrote you yesterday a short Letter of sincere congratulation on our success in the Election and as it will be some time before I can be at Washington I wish to detail to you the reasons that will inevitably detain me. When I was two Years since a candidate for the Senate I pledged myself to the republican Interest of this State to use every Exertion in my power to make a peace with France and place You in the chair and told them, that from my belief of their principles and some little knowledge of the American Character and people that I believed they only wanted to be properly informed and some Exertions to be used and *persevered in* to do every thing that was right. In a confidence in my Industry at least and perseverance, the upper Members on this occasion gave up in my favour a rule they had always observed, which was to have one senator from the Upper and one from the lower country, and elected me.[3] You know what has since happened with respect to France and my Exertions on that subject and it only remained at the present time to realize our Expectations respecting your Election. I clearly foresaw that if Pennsylvania did not *vote fully*, the Fortune of America depended in a great Measure on the Vote of this state. I also saw that the nomination of General Pinckney was done with a View to divide us and particularly calculated to place me in a difficult and delicate and perhaps dangerous situation. they supposed I had some influence here and thought that family reasons or the number of otherwise good republicans who would from private and personal attachment support General Pinckney, would draw me off or at least neutralize me. You must remember I mentioned this to You in Philadelphia and the event has fully justified

---

which Jefferson repeated in his well-known letter of December 15 to Burr. The information, it will be seen, reached him on December 12; on December 11 Senator Gunn understood the votes of South Carolina to be for Jefferson and Burr; Gunn to Hamilton, Hamilton's *Works*, VI. 483.

[1] See the Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1896*, pp. 858, 859.

[2] Jefferson Papers, Ser. 2, Vol. 66, No. 40. Endorsed by Jefferson: "rec^d^ Dec. 23."

[3] When Pinckney was elected the other senator from South Carolina was Jacob Read, a resident of Charleston, as Pinckney originally was.

the opinion I had at that time formed. I returned in June and immediately commenced my Writings and operations for the Elections that were to take place in October throughout every part of the state. The particulars of the CharLeston Election I transmitted and from the Loss of that (they have 17 members)[1] I found it was indispensible to redouble my Exertions. the Weight of Talent, Wealth, and personal and family influence Brought against us were so great, that after the Charleston Election was lost many of our most decided friends began to despair. the federal party acquired immense confidence and it was under these circumstances I found it indispensible to come CoLumbia myself and remain there until the Election was over. Most of our friends believe that my Exertions and influence owing to the information of federal affairs I gave them, has in a great measure contributed to the decision and firmly believing myself that they were indispensible to Your Success I did not suppose myself at Liberty to quit CoLumbia until it was over. they have insured to me the hatred and persecution of the federal party for ever and the loss of even the acquaintance or personal civility of many of my relatives, but I rejoice I have done my duty to my country and shall ever consider it as among the most fortunate Events of my Life. If as Governour Monroe writes me Pennsylvania is uncertain, and South Carolina has decided the Point, I shall doubly rejoice at the honour she has done herself and "*that she is South Carolina still.*" I am uncertain Yet when I shall, from important public reasons, be able to set out or whether by sea or land. I am at present better employed here in fixing the republican Interest in this state like a rock against which future federal storms may [beat] with less probability of success and when this is finished and the Election of a Senator over I mean to set out. In the interim Believe me with affectionate attachment and great respect

Dear Sir
Yours Truly
CHARLES PINCKNEY

December 1800
In CoLumbia

For fear of accidents to my former Letter, I inclose You a Duplicate of the Charleston Petition to shew what Difficulties we had to encounter there and the List of the Votes for Electors here to shew how hard and strongly contested their election has Been at CoLumbia. General Pinckney has taken his seat in the Senate the first Day[2] and is now in CoLumbia I am so occupied here night and Day in public Business that I have but one Moment to write to my friends and therefore I will thank You to communicate to my worthy friends General Mason and the Mr Nicholass and M^r Burr all such intelligence from our state as I send You or may transmit and you think I would wish them to know.

---

[1] Fifteen in the House and two in the Senate.

[2] Christopher G. Champlin, Congressman from Newport, writing from Washington on December 12, and discussing the news of the South Carolina election, which had arrived in Washington the evening before, says: "It seems two or three Federal Parishes lost their votes by double returns—that is to say: Gen. Pinckney was chosen to represent two or three different Parishes." G. C. Mason, *Reminiscences of Newport*, p. 111.

This will be delivered to you by a
Very confidential young man
who carries our eight Votes for
Yourself and M^r Burr and We have
been at great pains to get so
confidential a man to carry them.
To
The Honourable Thomas Jefferson
[*Addressed:*
"To
"The Honourable Thomas Jefferson
At the seat of the Government
of the United States
at
Washington
"Favoured by M^r George Brown"]

VI. CHARLES PINCKNEY TO JEFFERSON.[1]

Dear Sir

I wrote you some days since by the Express which carried our Votes and informed You of the necessity there was for my remaining sometime longer here to use my Exertions and those of my friends to fix the republican interest out of the reach of any future federal attack, that the Exertion of the federalists had been so uncommonly great in the late Election, as to give serious apprehensions to our friends particularly after the loss of the Charleston Election and that all the Talents Wealth and Influence of the Country had been on both sides brought into the Legislature, that believing the fortune of America to depend on our Vote I had thrown every consideration of affinity or Name or local attachment out of View and urged the giving the republican candidates *only*, our unanimous Vote. having carried this point We proceeded and have elected Yesterday a republican Governour[2] and M^r John Ewing Calhoun[3] a staunch republican as my Colleague in the Senate. there are still some points important to the republican Interest to be settled and which require my presence. I then propose to go immediately to Charleston and proceed from thence to Washington to join You in time for the French Treaty which I find has not yet arrived nor have We any certain accounts of its being Signed.[4]

---

[1] Jefferson Papers, Ser. 2, Vol. 66, No. 38. Endorsed by Jefferson: "rec^d Dec. 17."

[2] John Drayton. On the death of Governor Edward Rutledge, January 23, 1800, Drayton, being lieutenant-governor, had taken his place. The legislature now elected him governor.

[3] John Ewing Calhoun, cousin of John C. Calhoun, who married his daughter. He was graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1774, was often a member of the legislature of South Carolina, and was a U. S. senator from 1801 to 1802, in which year he died.

[4] It was signed September 30, 1800. Davie arrived at Norfolk with it on December 15.

You must recollect that when I saw You in Philadelphia I told You it would be late before I could see you this Session, that I considered the carrying Your Election in this State as the thing to which I ought above every other to Above every other to attend to, for that could We but carry that, all subordinate arrangements would follow of course and I well knew from General Pinckney's public and private influence the opposition would be formidable and that it would be dangerous to give him the Vote of this State even if he was upon the same ticket with You. but this both parties never thought of. both were so confident of their own strength and the junction of about a dozen cautious members who would not declare themselves for either, that they rejected at the outset, all idea of compromise, and never I believe has Disappointment been greater than to the Federalists, or Joy more sincere than to the Republicans. Our State has done itself immortal honour and will I trust be considered in future as one of those firm Pillars of American republicanism which no private affection or attachment or local interest can ever for a moment shake. as such I hope We shall have the honour of presenting her to You and I will undertake to promise her warmest support to those republican and liberal measures which We are all sure will so eminently distinguish Your administration and bless Your country. If no accident happens to my health you will see me as soon as the public good authorises me to leave this place and state. no private concerns ever detain me. embarked as I am in a great Cause I have been and am wholly devoted to it and with every sentiment of respect and affectionate attachment I am my dear sir

Yours truly

CHARLES PINCKNEY

December 6 : 1800
In CoLumbia

You very much surprise me by saying you have not received my Book and Numbers. The Book therefore I send again and enclose You all the Numbers I have. the remaining ten will be sent you. at present they have all that was here been distributed among the members, and the new Edition is only finished as far as I send them now—to the 14[th] partly. I will send the rest for I wish you very much to see the 4 Numbers on the Common Law as applicable to the Courts of the United States, and to give me your opinion of my reasonings on them.

For
The Honourable Thomas Jefferson

[*Addressed*:

"Free To
"The Honourable Thomas Jefferson
at the Seat of the Government of the
United States at Washington
Maryland
"By the Post"
Postmarked: "Columbia S. C.
Dec. 6."]

VII. CHARLES PINCKNEY TO JEFFERSON.[1]

Dear Sir

Having finished the public Business I went to CoLumbia on I was returning to Charleston to take shipping for Washington and at this place met with a paper which is inclosed and which has surprised me exceedingly. is it possible that the State of Pennsylvania has been deprived of her Vote by a majority of two in the senate ?[2] Or, taking the whole number of the federal part of their senate together, by *13 men, and that,* after the public opinion had been expressed by so decided a majority in every way in which their Citizens had an opportunity of doing so? and what is to *be result?* fortunately for the United States South Carolina has by her Vote decided the Election without Pennsylvania but will the people of that state so easily acquiesce in being thus deprived of their constitutional right and of the honour of having participated in the change that is to take place? I now feel doubly pleased that I remained and went to CoLumbia to aid with my Exertions the securing the Vote of this State *entire*, for had she Voted otherwise I can scarcely concieve what may have been the consequence and you must have long before this been convinced that without the Vote of this state the Event might have been doubtful; for that of Rhode Island was a Was a thing scarcely to have been looked for, and I am afraid even now to rely implicitly on it as we have just heard that some of our intelligence from Maryland is premature and that after all You will not have more than one half their Vote. I wish you to be handsomely elected and to have so many sound Votes to spare that no little carpings or cavils at dates or Words or trifles shall vitiate the Election or give to your opponents the most distant right to dispute it's regularity. I trust You and all my friends at Washington have received all my letters and therefore are not surprised at not seeing me with You yet. I knew my presence at CoLumbia to be of more consequence, than it could possible be elsewhere, for I was always afraid Pennsylvania would not vote. M^{r} Monroe's Letter which I inclose to you strengthened this opinion and therefore I gave up the idea of going to Congress and went there. I send You M^{r} Monroe's Letter to shew you how convinced I was and ought to have been, that Our state was to decide and as I have always made a point of attending my public duties with diligence I wish You and my friends to know the absolute necessity there was for my absence and not to blame it. I intend, if nothing prevents to be with You sometime in January and until then I remain with great Esteem and regard Dear Sir Yours Truly

CHARLES PINCKNEY

I omitted to mention to You that *the Letters* I got from M^{r} Monroe and you, both shewed marks of having *been opened*

---

[1] Jefferson Papers, Ser. 2, Vol. 66, No. 42. Endorsed by Jefferson: "rec^{d} Jan. 4."

[2] The Senate of Pennsylvania (Federalist) by a vote of 13 to 11 rejected a House bill providing for the election of electors by joint ballot of the two houses.

Winyaw (in South Carolina) December 20 1800

If Colonel Hampton[1] of this State should go to Washington and call upon You I beg to introduce him to You in the most particular manner as one of our best friends and whose communications and services in the republican cause have been very important to us. it is with great concern I have just heard that my fears on the Rhode Island head were too well founded. I was always afraid that much good could not come out of either Nazareth or Galilee and I find I was right. New England is New England *still* and unless an earthquake could remove them and give them about ten degrees of our southern sun in their constitutions they will always remain so. You may as well attempt to separate the Barnacle from the Oyster, or a body of Caledonians as to divide New England. not so our southern Gentry. View MaryLand and North Carolina and tell me by what Policy can it be, that We have lost so many Votes from states who ought to cling to the southern republican interest as to the rock of their *earthly* salvation—states too with whom so much pains have been taken to direct them in the right road.

I must request You not to come to any determination with respect to arrangements in this state until You see me, if I live to come on, as I have some information I do not choose to commit to Paper to give You after which, you will be better able to judge what is best to be done here. I have reasons very important to the republican interest for making this request, reasons which our late very arduous contest in this State could alone have developed, but which are very important to You to know.

To
The Honourable Thomas Jefferson

[*Addressed*:
"In Town
22 Dec^r To
The Honourable Thomas Jefferson
At the City of
FREE
Washington
in
"By Post—— Maryland"]

VIII. CHARLES PINCKNEY TO JEFFERSON.[2]

Dear Sir

I wrote you some weeks since informing you that after the finishing some indispensible public Business important to the continuance and increase of the republican interest in this state I should go to Charleston and proceed from thence by Water either to Baltimore or to Washington as passages offered. Since this I am concerned to inform You that in my way down from CoLumbia stopping at this place I have been siezed with a most violent cold and sore throat occasioned by the severe cold weather we have had and my being exposed to it. it has confined me to my chamber and continues to oppress me very much. I am afraid it will be sometime before I can go on to Charleston, where I left my little ones, and to which place I have written to my friends to look out for a passage from thence to Baltimore that I may be with you as soon as possible after I am better. I wish I was with You now but my absence was inevitable, as I am sure I did more good by going up to our Legislature at CoLumbia than I could have done by going to any other Part of the Globe at that time. Whenever I see you and present to You *my situation* at CoLumbia and what passed there You will be not a little astonished. it has unravelled *mysteries* which I wish to explain to You and is the reason for my requesting You not to think of any arrangements for this State until You recieve the information I have collected and prepared for You, after which You will be fully able to judge for Yourself and know what is best to be done

---

[1] Colonel Wade Hampton; see *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, pp. 845-850.

[2] Jefferson Papers, Ser. 2, Vol. 66, No. 41. Endorsed by Jefferson: "rec^d Jan. 25."

the feds have had some hopes of creating confusion by there being an equality of Votes but I find by the inclosed Extract that Tennessee has made a difference of one Vote,[1] and as Your Majority over federal candidates is so great there can be no cavil. I am hopeful to be with You before the Votes are opened and counted and am with affectionate respect and attachment

Dear Sir
Yours Truly
CHARLES PINCKNEY

January 8: 1801
At Winyaw

I am glad the French convention is ratified By Senate.[2] it was feared the payment for Captures might have been a clog by the disappointed federalists But I suppose the public opinion has overawed them and it passed as a matter of course. they would not venture to stop it.

IX. CHARLES PINCKNEY TO JEFFERSON.[3]

Dear Sir

Although not sufficiently recovered from the effects of my late fall from my carriage to venture it I propose embarking on sunday to join you at Washington having taken my passage for that purpose and as I cannot travel by land, again venture a Winter Voyage by sea. I write this Line to inform you of it and to mention that having seen in the Northern papers an account that a compromise was offered and rejected by the Federalists I do positively deny that any such compromise was offered by the body of the republican interest or ever intended by them.. if any thing ever was said on that subject it must have been by some one or two of our friends who might have been very anxious to secure Your Election and would rather compromise than risque it, but if even one did whisper such a thing it was *wholly unknown* to me, or to the great Body of republican interest, for they were determined from the Jump never to hear of any compromise, and so far from thinking of it they met at the academy hall in CoLumbia the very first Night of the Session and near seventy of them signed a Paper and determined not to compromise but to support the Ticket of the republican interest as it was run and carried. Ten Members from the Lower Country were absent—out of these Ten three federalists three of the republican interest and four Ties or Equalities common to both. the average Majority to be relied upon on the joint Vote was 19 and I mention this to you to shew that there is never the least Danger of the South Carolina Legislature.

---

[1] A mistake. Tennessee gave three votes to Jefferson and three to Burr, and in the total each had 73 votes.

[2] It was not ratified till February 3.

[3] Jefferson Papers, Ser. 2, Vol. 66, No. 41 a. Endorsed by Jefferson: "recd Feb. 8."

The last Election was the most federal I ever knew in our state owing to Charleston and obvious reasons. the Wind having changed, certain influences will change also and under a proper Management I do not doubt Charleston may be made one of *the Strongholds of* republicanism as it possesses most excellent Materials.—Health, affectionate respect and Esteem conclude me Dear Sir

Yours Truly
Charles Pinckney
January 24: 1801
In Charleston

X. CHARLES PINCKNEY TO JEFFERSON.[1]

Dear Sir

I recollect before I left Carolina I requested you by letter not to make any arrangements or take any step respecting that State until I had seen you as I had some opinions and information to communicate on that subject.

On reflection since, I have been induced to suppose that this request on my part was an improper one, and that I ought not to presume so far as to wish to intrude on you my opinions on state arrangements, or any other subject, even as they respect South CaroLina. I therefore intreat, You will *not recollect such* a request has ever been made *by me.* motives of delicacy and unfeigned respect for you make this request proper on my part before I leave Georgetown.

From the difficulty of obtaining such a conveyance either by land or water from hence as is convenient I am afraid I shall be detained some days. if in the interim M^r Madison for whom I have had an unchangeable respect and friendship should arrive I will be particularly obliged to you to ask him to inform me of it that I may have an opportunity of seeing him before I go.

---

[1] Jefferson Papers, Ser. 2, Vol. 66, No. 37. Endorsed by Jefferson "rec^d Mar. 6."

If you remain here as long as I do I will do myself the honour of paying my respects to You before I set out and with my most sincere wishes for Your health and honour and success in the administration I remain with respect and regard

Dear Sir
Yours Truly
CHARLES PINCKNEY
March 5 : 1801
GeorgeTown

NOTE. "*Journal of the most remarkable Occurrences in Quebec 1775.*"

Some years ago I received from London a manuscript diary which was entitled "Journal of the most remarkable occurrences in Quebec, since Arnold appear'd before the Town on the 14th November 1775," which I have only recently had an opportunity of examining. It is a foolscap octavo, 6 inches by 3¾, containing 95 pages and title, closely written in a uniform hand and ink, apparently at the end of the eighteenth century. The title gives no indication of authorship, but the regularity of the entries forbids the idea of its being an original. No clue exists as to its former ownership or history, further than that it was sold at a sale in London.

When looking into it, my attention was called to the diary published by the New York Historical Society in their *Collections* for 1880, p. 173, which at first glance appeared to be the same. A closer examination, however, revealed the fact that great liberties had been taken either with the manuscript or with the printed copy.

The librarian of the New York Historical Society, Mr. Kelby, kindly informed me, in response to my enquiry, that they had reprinted it from William Smith's *History of Canada*, Quebec, 1815, Vol. 2, p. 81, and a reference to that book confirmed the statement. It is a most circumstantial account of the attack by Montgomery and Arnold on Quebec, written by one of the defenders, and I was therefore surprised to find another version in existence.

The manuscript differs from the printed copy in being more concise. The lists of troops, the condition of the weather and the direction of the wind are identical, except in the first list, p. 177, *N. Y. H. S. Coll.*, where a palpable misprint, copied from Smith, destroys the correctness of the addition. Smith, as Chief Justice of Quebec, and a loyalist from New York State, with some literary reputation, must have had access to many documents which have since disappeared. He prints the diary as a footnote, without note or comment, adding to the title "By an Officer of the Garrison." The style of the manuscript is that of a military man; that of the printed copy is more fluent, and the expanded and inverted sentences bear trace of a more practised writer. The paragraphs which have been added or altered are not those which relate to matters purely military. The prefatory matter on the first four pages of the printed copy (*N. Y. H. S. Coll.*) are represented by barely two and a half pages of manuscript, while the following extracts will give some idea of the discrepancies between the two texts:

MS.	*New York Hist. Soc. Coll. 1880.*
Dec 4. It froze hard in the night. The wind is at W today, the air clear and cold. The habitants inform us that the rebels are lodged in St Foix parish and in the parish of Little River none of them are much above two miles from our walls. One Jeremiah Duggan formerly a hairdresser here is now stil'd Major and heads 500 Canadians.	4th. Wind at W today. It froze hard in the night. The rebels are lodged in every house near the walls. Jeremiah Duggan, formerly a hairdresser in this place has the command of 500 Canadians, under the title of Major.
8th . . . A horse standing at Menut's door was kill'd by a cannon ball, a few minutes after Mr Montgomery got out of the cariole.	8th . . . Mr Montgomery visited Menut's today. A few minutes after he got out of the cariole a cannon ball from the walls killed his horse.
31st Wind N. E. Snowy and cloudy. We may expect to be attacked, if what the deserter says is true. Capt. Malcolm Fraser of the Royal Emigrants in going his rounds between 4 and 5 o'clock this morning perceived signals from the enemy, he immediately alarmed the guards and picquets, who stood to their arms. All our sentrys saw flashes like lightning all around, those between St Johns Gate and Cape Diamond saw an avenue of lanterns set up on poles at regular distance. Rockets were thrown up and immediately a hot fire of musketry was kept up from behind some ridges of snow within 80 yards of the walls at Cape Diamond. The drums beat to arms, the bells rang the alarm, and in less than ten	31st. About four o'clock this morning, Captain Malcolm Fraser, of Colonel Maclean's regiment, in going his rounds perceived signals not very far from St John's Gate, and finding the weather such as the enemy wished for, by the last deserter's report, he alarmed the guards and picquets who stood to their arms. All the sentries between Cape Diamond and Palace Gate saw many and repeated flashes like lightning; on the heights of Abraham lights like lanthorns were placed on poles at regular distances. Two rockets were thrown up from the foot of Cape Diamond, and immediately a hot fire was kept up on those who lined the walls at that place, and a body of men were seen in St Johns suburbs and from the

minutes every person able to bear arms was in motion. Even old men upwards of 70 were forward in appearing armed for the defence of the Town. A party of the British Militia under Col Caldwell was immediately detached by Col McLean to reinforce Cape Diamond, as it was said an attack would be made there. There he posted the party and return'd to the Parade. Mr Montgomery attack'd at the same time at Près de Ville with 900 pick'd men, and Arnold attack'd at Saut au Matelot, with 700 chosen fellows, while the fire was kep up at Cape Diamond. A strong party ('tis said Canadians) appear'd in the suburb of St Johns—their bomb battery play'd on us from St Roc. Our guard at Près de Ville had perceived the flashes for some time and every man was ready at his post the gunners with lighted matches stood ready to give the rebels a warm reception; tho' the night was very dark with thick snow, yet they were seen approaching; a body of about 150 came within 50 yds of our guns, they made a stand at a narrow pass as if in consultation. Capt Barnsfare who commanded the guns watch'd the time and fir'd the instant they began to move forward, shrieks and groans were heard but nobody was seen after this cool discharge. He continued his fire nevertheless for some time.

April 9th . . . Mr. Chaucer has said a great deal, we suspect that he came in with no good-intention—he will be taken care of.

April 17th . . . The Press'd Laforce to come on shore, but know-

flashes of the enemy's firing we perceived they were hid behind a bank of snow; however, we returned their fire directed by their flashes; during this sharp musketry the drums were beating to arms, the bells rang the alarm, and in less than ten minutes every man in the garrison was under arms at his alarm post; even old men upward of 70 were seen forward to oppose the rebels. Colonel MacLean detached a party of the British Militia under Colonel Caldwell to reinforce Cape Diamond; there he was to make the disposition of the men and return to the parade. Mr. Montgomery with 900 of the best men attacked at Près de Ville and Arnold with 700 chosen fellows attacked at Sault au Matelot. The attack at Cape Diamond, the Parade of men (Canadians it is said) near St John's Gate, with a bombardment from St Roc's were intended to draw off our attention from the lower town where the rebels were to make the real attacks.

Our guard at Près de Ville had seen the flashes, every man was posted before the alarm was given the gunners with lighted matches waiting the word of command. Captain Barnsfair, who commanded the battery, coolly waited the near approach of the enemy; he saw a group advancing; they stopped within 50 yards of our guns; there they seemed in consultation; at last they rushed forward to their destruction, for our grape shot mowed them down; groans and cries were heard but not a soul was seen. However, we kept sweeping the road with our guns and musquetry for some time.

April 9th . . . Thus far Mr. Chaucer has informed us; he is suspected as a spy and will be taken care of accordingly.

April 17 . . . They pressed Laforce to go on shore; but aware of

ing the Pointlevians too well to trust himself among them, he bid them adieu paddled on his way.	Point Levy treachery, he paddled away with a "*bon soir.*"
April 18 . . . Their speaker ended with a huzza and the three hundred heartily joined him. Immediately their drums beat to arms, these men were surrounded, they were ill used and confined.	April 18 . . . Their speaker ended with a "*God save the King,*" which was echoed by one and all of them with three cheers. Immediately these men were surrounded; they were very ill used and confined.
Final. The rebels stole upon us and thus they left us.	Final. The rebels stole in upon us through the woods; a dreadful panic seized them and they left us precipitately.

These extracts show that the diaries are virtually the same, and that additions and alterations have been made in the printed text. It is also quite evident that these changes must have been made by some one thoroughly familiar with the city and the story of the seige and able to add a few local incidents. Whether by the diarist himself, rewriting his diary in after years, or by Chief Justice Smith, is not now likely to be known, but the occasional ultra-loyal alterations point in the direction of the Loyalist.

JAMES BAIN, JR.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Method in History for Teachers and Students. By WILLIAM H. MACE, Professor of History in Syracuse University. (Boston and London: Ginn and Co. 1897. Pp. xvii, 311.)

THIS small volume is chiefly concerned with the problem of interpreting American history to students in the secondary and primary schools. It is not a book of devices. The term "Method," says the author, "is not even intended to suggest diagrams, chronological charts, or expedients of like nature. But something far more fundamental has been the aim: the determining factors in method. . . . Whether diagrams, outlines, maps, and so on are to be used in teaching history cannot be decided by the whim of the teacher." The appeal must be made to principles. In other words Professor Mace has set himself the task of getting at the philosophy of method, so far at least as it can have a direct bearing upon the teaching of history, and of American history in particular. The book is divided into three parts: 1. The General Nature of History (pp. 1–76); 2. Organization of the Periods of American History (pp. 77–254); 3. The Elementary Phases of History Teaching (pp. 255–308).

History, according to Professor Mace, is a study of two sets of facts: a people's acts and a people's thoughts and feelings. Acts are the superficial evidence of ideas; they are the outer form of the subject-matter, while the ideas constitute the content or essence of history. As history is the study of the continuous growth or evolution of man in society through more or less marked changes in ideas, it is possible to distinguish five well-marked phases in the history of a people, a political, a religious, an educational, an industrial, and a social phase. These phases are distinguished by five organizations or "institutions:" the government, the church, the school, occupation, and the family. Speaking figuratively, Professor Mace conceives the life of a people as a "mighty stream of five currents." Thus having reduced the subject to such limits Professor Mace would value an event in history in proportion as it expresses the growth of "institutional" life. "That event or period has the highest historical value which reveals most fully the people's institutional thought and feeling" (p. 67). De Soto's expedition should be studied in a course in American history, for it had a "more intimate connection with our institutions" than the work of most Spanish explorers. One would attend to the work of George Rogers Clark or to that of Daniel Boone in proportion to its contributions to the growth of

American institutions. Inasmuch as Indian institutions did not "flow into or become a part of American institutions," Indian history may be called "non-American" history (p. 81).

Professor Mace's analysis of American history is guided by his peculiar theory of "institutions." For pedagogical purposes he casts to one side the discoveries and explorations—these belong to American history only in so far as they tended to fix the locations of "institutions." Between 1607 and 1870 he finds three periods, every one of which is marked by a dominant movement in institutional growth. Previous to 1760 the prevailing ideas of the colonists tend to the rise and growth of local institutions—the five great institutions. The New England men seek a general diffusion of rights and privileges. The Southern men on the other hand are for centralization of rights. The middle colonists are guided by no one dominant idea, but yield to the force that comes from a blending of the two somewhat distinct tendencies found in New England and in the South. From 1760 to 1789 the dominant idea is that of union: before 1783 it is union against England, and after that date it has developed distinctly into union on domestic questions. The idea of nationality which was at work before 1789 has constituted since that time a new era in institutional evolution. In analyzing the incidents and ideas of this third period (1789–1870) Professor Mace is at his best. He writes rather as a historian than as a pedagogue, and has not much occasion to force his "institutional" theory into the foreground.

If the history of institutions is to have relatively a distinct place as one phase of the study of history, then Professor Mace's theory is misleading. He has based his volume upon such terms as "institution" and "institutional ideas," terms which he has nowhere defined. To these terms he has reduced everything of consequence in American history by the application of one test. The structures of society are numerous. At the basis of civilization is the family: without it there would be no such thing as the church or the state, a system of industry or a system of education. It is thus of fundamental importance to the historian without being of first importance. Mr. Spencer has given much attention to the family. Professor McMaster, Mr. Bryce and Mr. Lecky have comparatively little to say about it. The structures with which the historian of institutions may concern himself are the systems or numerous organizations in the state which give to any country its organic unity and serve by their continuous existence to bind the past to the present. Behind these structures is the people's life, full of emotions, ideas, actions, to which no single test can ever be applied by historian, philosopher, or scientist. If there is any clear law in history it is that of incessant motion. Discrimination in the use of terms is lacking in Professor Mace's book. As a consequence his doctrine is vague and misleading. The true safe-guard for the teacher who reads the volume is his or her own interest in things simply because they were.

Henry Barrett Learned.

◆

An Essay on Western Civilization in its Economic Aspects (*Ancient Times*). By W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D., LL.D., Lecturer of Trinity College, Cambridge. [Cambridge Historical Series.] (Cambridge: University Press. 1898. Pp. xii, 220.)

THIS essay is an interesting and useful attempt to "bring out the main economic features in the growth and diffusion of the civilized life in Western Europe, to which so many peoples and countries have contributed." It is an analysis of that heritage of industrial skill and commercial enterprise which the English nation now enjoys, and is diffusing over the East. Considering the immense difficulties of the task, it has been well performed. Some of these difficulties are clearly specified by the author, some not mentioned are clearly felt by him, and some, perhaps not properly realized by him, become obvious to the reader. The social and economic sides of ancient life among the peoples contributing to Western civilization were never properly described by the writers whom we must now use as sources of information, and all the wealth of monuments rendered accessible by archaeological discovery throws but an imperfect light upon the subject. Again, many modern economical and social relations did not exist at all in ancient life. They are the outcome, not of embryo devices and institutions of a more primitive society, but of inventions made outright by totally different forms of society. It is often impossible to determine where evolution set in and where invention or creation was exercised. Competition, credit, organization, labor, machinery, co-operation, combination, all mighty elements in modern economical questions, played no large rôle in ancient life. The economics of ancient life, even under imperial systems, seem therefore barren of great freely-moving forces. Absolutism on the one hand, and slavery on the other, together with the difficulties of transportation and international intercourse, and limited economical institutions, imposed upon them local characteristics. Still again, the energies of ancient life were absorbed by politics rather than by economics—the energies, that is, of the free class. It is only with the advent of free industrialism that economical relations assume a magnitude which compels typical development and evolution. Political systems and institutions enveloped and hampered economical institutions. It is, therefore, very difficult to study ancient economics apart from ancient politics, ancient commerce apart from ancient war.

The difficulties of the task being so great, it is not strange that the author's object is not fully attained. Still, it is sufficiently attained to justify the attempt. Occasionally, the narrower purpose of the book seems to merge into a larger one, that of determining the quota which each great people of the past has supplied to Western civilization in general. At such times the reader is obliged to consider what he reads a useless iteration of what has been as well said elsewhere, in the larger political histories of ancient peoples. It is easier, however, for the general historian to add his chapters of economic history to his political outline, than for the special historian of economics to exclude the larger political issues from his more restricted field.

Book I. gives a survey, in three chapters, of the economical conditions which prevailed in Egypt, Judaea, and Phoenicia. Egypt is a lone example of a "self-sufficing" country, developed from a simple grazing and herding land, by a vast artificial agricultural system favored by extraordinary natural advantages, into a densely peopled territory, capable of supporting its own inhabitants and all the visitors attracted to it, and of erecting for its rulers the most imperishable monuments of their wealth and power. The lack of sea-power, however, and the absence of centrifugal tendencies, made her almost wholly receptive. Her arts and learning were disseminated by her guests, and not by her own people. "Control of the food-supply was the basis of the Pharaohs' power," but that power could only conquer and exact tribute outside the Nile valley. It could not spread Egyptian civilization.

The empire of Solomon, in Palestine, formed a race which, in its dispersion, has rigidly preserved its habits and character. "They have not devoted themselves to industrial employment, nor shewn the enterprise which opens new markets or pushes fresh lines of discovery, but they have patiently pursued the humbler courses of commercial activity, as retailers and brokers." All this people ever had they took from successful neighbors. Their country was fruitful, intersected by caravan routes which made the products of other countries available through trade, and occupied by a conquered slave class which rendered manual and industrial labor unnecessary on the part of the Israelite.

The Phoenicians developed a "carrying trade between distant countries, but they were also engaged actively in importing materials and exporting manufactures for themselves." Their policy of exhausting their sources of supply, instead of enriching them, after the manner of modern English commerce, made their mission, on the whole, a cruel one. Their great industrial civilization fell, because it depended on the products of other lands for its maintenance.

Thus the salient economic traits of each of these three peoples are traced with a bold hand. The debt of Greece to Assyria and Persia might also have been distinguished. Indeed the omission of these peoples in favor of the Hebrews is a feature of the book which it is hard to justify.

Books II. and III. deal with the more familiar fields of Greek and Roman life. The Greek was eager "in the development of commerce and the race for wealth, but treated material prosperity as a means to an end—an opportunity for the maintenance of political and intellectual life." The great influence of money economy on Greek civilization is ably and strikingly developed. The permanence of the type of city organization presented by Athens is emphasized. Athens furnishes precedents in municipal, and also in national finance. Her great economic error, that of devoting public wealth to vast unproductive public works, is often forgotten in the charm exercised by her art and literature. The city, as "a centre of noble political and active economic life," was a Greek creation. Greek experiments in organizing government over large areas were only partially successful. But they paved the way for the greater and more permanent success of the Romans. Then came the Christian Church, the era of discovery and the age of invention, with modifications of old institutions and creation of new ones. But "the main questions of household economy, of city economy and of national economy, which recur again and again, all came within the cognizance of the Greeks."

Phoenicians and Carthaginians attempted to "pursue an exclusive commerce, and to keep all rivals out of the field." Hellenic freedom of commerce triumphed against the Phoenician directly, and through Rome against the Carthaginian. The Roman extended the successful application of Hellenic economics over the world. Constantinople stored up the best attainments of Hellenic principles under Roman application, till the modern nations were ready to receive them.

B. PERRIN.

Pausanias's Description of Greece. Translated, with a Commentary, by J. G. FRAZER, M.A., LL.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (London and New York: The Macmillan Co. 1898. Six vols, pp. xcvi, 616, 582, 652, 447, 638, 199.)

IT is not every guide-book that appeals to the historical reviewer, nor is it every Sentimental Journey that justifies translation and commentary to the extent of six bulky volumes. But the *Periegesis* of Pausanias, in whichever quality we consider it, does both. In characterizing it as "a plain, unvarnished account by an eye-witness of the state of Greece in the second century of our era," Mr. Frazer tells but half the truth. It is all that and much more. Between the lines of the old traveller's note-book and in his wide-ranging digressions we read the whole story of the mightier Hellas which had long since passed away.

It must have been near the middle of the second century when the Lydian Greek, reared in the shadow of Mt. Sipylus and steeped in the myths and memories of his race, set his face toward the fatherland across the Aegean. Already well travelled in the East, he proposed now "to describe the whole of Greece" (or rather "all things Greek")—evidently intending to confine his view to the mainland, as he passes in silence the storied isles of the Aegean to jot down his first note at Sunium. Reaching Athens when Herodes Atticus was in the midst of his munificent activity (the Odeion was not yet built), he took up the great task which was to occupy him for many years. In the *Attica,* which appears to have been written and published before the rest, he is feeling his way and working out his method; then with a surer step he makes the round of the Peloponnese and returns to central Greece, where his further survey is confined to Boeotia and Phocis. Northern Greece is not included in the *Description* though the author had visited Thermopylae, whose hot springs he pronounces "the bluest water that he ever saw." Thus the primal Hellas is not on his map nor is Dodona in his guide-book; he does not even cross the Euripus to describe the great Eubœan cities of Chalcis and Eretria. Indeed, as Frazer remarks, "his book has neither head nor tail." He plunges into Attica without a word of introduction, and he breaks off abruptly with his account of Ozolian Locris.

But even so he has covered the ground of first importance, and what he has not done only enhances our estimate of his actual performance. Wherever Pausanias has blazed the way, we have a sure and usually sufficient guide; where he stops, we are left more or less in the dark. As Mr. Frazer well says: "Without him the ruins of Greece would for the most part be a labyrinth without a clue, a riddle without an answer. His book furnishes the clue to the labyrinth, the answer to many riddles." So the Germans have found at Olympia, the English at Megalopolis, and the Greeks at Lycosura, as the French are finding at Delphi and the Americans at Corinth; but perhaps the value of the clue can best be measured by those who have had to spade without it at Dodona and Delos and Eretria.

Thus, for all the perverse contention of certain Germans that Pausanias did not describe at first hand the Greece of his own time but slavishly copied from Polemo and other old writers descriptions of the country as it had been three hundred years before, the spade has amply vindicated his integrity and every new site explored adds further confirmation. Pausanias has been there, and his own eyes have seen what his pen describes. We do not need the recurring note of personal knowledge—as when at Amyclae he remarks "I saw the throne and I will describe it as I saw it"—to convince us of the fact. Of course, he should have acquainted himself with the works of earlier *periegetes* as we prepare for the tour of Greece by careful study of Leake and Curtius and Tozer, if we cannot carry them with us; and yet our editor shows by a detailed comparison that "the existing fragments of Polemo hardly justify us in supposing that Pausanias was acquainted" even with this the greatest of his predecessors.

As a "description of Greece," then, the work is Pausanias's own, the plain matter-of-fact record of a plodding painstaking observer who takes his bearings; measures his distances; charts every mountain, stream and town; locates every theatre and temple; and describes or at least mentions every statue and picture that is "worth seeing." To the ordinary reader all this is tiresome enough; he longs for a bit of scenery, for a breath of life, as when (and it is all too rarely) Pausanias turns from the monuments of the past to remark that: "The women of Patrae are twice as many as the men, and more charming women are nowhere to be seen. Most of them earn their livelihood by the fine flax that grows in Elis; for they weave it into nets for their hair and dresses" (vii, *21*, 7); and, a little further on, "beside the river is a grove of plane-trees, most of which are hollow with age, and so big that people picnic in their hollow trunks, ay, and sleep there too if they have a mind."

But the explorer, to whom mountain and plain and river and forest still speak for themselves as the crabbed Greek of Pausanias never could have spoken for them, takes kindly to the old traveller's method and finds his dull topography and his catalogue of monuments above all price. Thanks to him, he can exactly locate the buried cities and theatres and temples; ay, and he knows where to look for the bases at least of nearly three thousand statues bearing the signature of some one hundred and fifty sculptors.

But Pausanias gives us much more than topography and monuments, much more than an eye-witness account of the Greece of his own time. For in the old Dryasdust there was a vein of sentiment and a strain of patriotism to which "all things Greek" appealed. He could not stop with his card-catalogue. Of myth and ritual, of legend and folk-lore, his pages are full; every temple has its cult, every monument its story, and all that may piously be told he tells. This is a trite observation; but few perhaps realize how much of solid history is bound up in the *Description of Greece*. Not to speak of the historical digressions (notably in the *Attica* and the *Phocis*), the continuous historical introduction takes up one-third of the *Laconia*, more than half of the *Achaia*, and four-fifths of the *Messenia*. Here, of course, Pausanias is drawing largely upon literary sources; and where these are lost (as in the case of Messenia) he becomes an ultimate if not an unquestioned authority. So his vivid story of the Celtic incursions not only stirs the blood but it fills a gap in history. Withal the old pedant more than once forgets himself in the patriot—a character of which we already begin to be conscious as we follow him from the Dipylon to the Academy along that street of soldiers' graves and see him stop to make a note like this: "Here are buried Conon and Timotheus, a glorious father and a glorious son, like Miltiades and Cimon before them." But the patriot has learned many a sad lesson when, in summing up Achaean history, he tells us how "like a fresh shoot on a blasted and withered trunk, the Achaean League rose on the ruins of Greece."

If our estimate of Pausanias is just, the wonder is not that he has now found an editor as patient and painstaking as himself, but that he has had to wait so long for his coming. The nearest approach to an exhaustive commentary hitherto is Leake's *Travels in Greece*—a monumental work by a master of topography who has never yet been matched; but Leake travelled and wrote before the revelations of the spade had fairly begun. In Curtius's *Peloponnesos* we have a more brilliant commentary, so far as it goes. But the editors proper had hardly got beyond Attica, when Mr. Frazer stepped to the front with an edition of Pausanias more complete in its way perhaps than had yet been achieved in the case of any ancient author. In this long labor of fourteen years—as long a labor, possibly, as Pausanias's own—we have everything an editor could offer us except the primary thing, the original text; and that exception we regret. We could have better spared the long appendix on "the Pre-Persian Temple" (which is here reprinted), and the entire text could have been printed in the index volume without swelling it beyond the average.

In his translation Mr. Frazer has achieved a very difficult task in a masterly way. Pausanias's style is hardly as hideous as his editor paints it—"a loose, clumsy, ill-jointed, ill-compacted, rickety, ram-shackle style without ease or grace or elegance of any sort"—but it is certainly about as bad a style as any Greek, even a modern Greek, could employ. For this crabbed Greek our translator gives us idiomatic, lucid, often racy English: thus "Demosthenes never fingered a penny of the gold that Harpalus brought from Asia" (ii, *33*, 4); "King Archidamus himself had a finger in the sacred pie" at Delphi (iv, *10*, 3); and "when Demaratus was born his father, Aristo [who, as we are subsequently told, 'had wedded the foulest maid and fairest wife in Lacedaemon'] blurted out some silly words about the brat not being his" (iii, *4*, 4). These vivacities are not unwelcome on the dusty way we travel; but there are turns we frankly detest, such as "Market Zeus," "Horse Poseidon," "Locust Apollo," "Diver-Bird Athena" and so on through the whole pantheon of epithets. Still Mr. Frazer is not seduced by his own style, but reproduces his author with substantial if not slavish fidelity, while he clears a thousand stumbling-blocks out of the reader's path. Where none but the seasoned archaeologist could find any comfort in the original, a multitude of laymen who care for Greek things may read this translation with unflagging interest and real pleasure. It ought to be accessible to such readers in a volume by itself, together with the proper index and the admirable introduction which precedes it.

The commentary which takes up four stout volumes (aggregating 2,319 pages) is nothing less than encyclopedic. It embodies a digest of the immense literature of travel, research and excavation, down to 1897, as well as notes of the editor's own journeys in Greece in 1890 and 1895. We have some 450 pages on Athens alone, 260 on Olympia, and 160 on Delphi—the last enriched by the official plan of the French excavations still in progress there, with heliograph reproductions of the Frieze of the Siphnian Treasury, and Robert's restorations of Polygnotus's famous paintings of the Capture of Troy and the Netherworld. It may be remarked, in passing, that the apparatus of plans and maps throughout the work is abundant and excellent, though as much can hardly be said for the text-illustrations. So, while the index to the translation is very full, that to the commentary is painfully meagre. Where Pausanias dismisses Mycenae with two scant pages, mainly of legendary lore, Frazer gives us seventy pages of commentary in his text and ten more in his Addenda. Not content with telling us what Schliemann and Tsountas have actually found there, he goes on to sum up the progress of Mycenaean discovery at large and to discuss the ancient civilization thus brought to light. The whole exposition is worthy of a specialist, and it shows perhaps as well as any other instance how completely our editor has mastered his material. It is indeed surprising how thoroughly he has exploited the very latest literature of his subject. Thus he avails himself of our new Bacchylides in advance of Kenyon's *editio princeps* for an excellent note (V. 390); though, with the proof of "The Youths and Theseus" in hand, he should have mended his translation of i, *17*, 3 where Pausanias's tense (ἦγεν) is to be taken strictly as the poem shows. While he modestly confesses to "being an expert in none of the branches of archaeology," he is certainly well up in most of them; and he does not hesitate to argue the point with the accredited masters, as when he takes issue with Doerpfeld on the "Old Temple," the Enneakrounos, and the Greek stage.

Merely as a compendious record of archaeological research from the first great campaigns at Mycenae and Olympia to those now in progress at Delphi and Corinth, this work is invaluable; but it goes further and pours floods of light and learning on every topic that Pausanias touched, and their name is legion. We can refer here only to the folklore which is always cropping out in the old *periegete* and which never fails to set his editor off on excursions to the ends of the earth—as when he bags the forty-one variations of the Virgin and the Dragon tale (V. 143 f.) or the twenty-eight versions of the Clever Thief (V. 176 ff.). Readers of the "Golden Bough," in which Mr. Frazer had already devoted two volumes as bulky as any of these six to the elucidation of a single obscure Italian cult, will readily understand the zest with which he fares afield whenever game of this kind is scented.

It is to be regretted that, in another sense, he fares afield so little. You cannot well edit a traveller in your study, even though its "windows look on the tranquil court of an ancient college." The ideal editor of Pausanias should have first of all the qualification of Leake—he should have retraced every footstep of his author; but Mr. Frazer appears to have devoted seven years to his task before ever setting foot in Greece. Now we rightly insist on first-hand description in our author and we can ask no less of his editor. But here we have in his text (II. 448 ff.) an account of Rhamnus, written in the style of an eye-witness, but obviously compiled "in the still air of delightful studies" so feelingly alluded to in his preface. For on turning to his Addenda (V. 529), we read: "I visited Rhamnus 18th December, 1895, and found that the description given in the text needs to be corrected in a few points;" and he proceeds to make at least ten material corrections. Other instances occur where second-hand descriptions in the text are helped out in the Addenda by subsequent observations of his own; and some important sites (for example, Pylus and Sphacteria) he would seem not to have visited at all. Wherever he has used his own eyes, Mr. Frazer's observation is so fresh and his descriptions so charming as to deepen our regret that more of his work was not done on the spot.

Of the admirable introduction—the quintessence of the whole matter—we have left little time to speak. Nothing better has ever been written on the subject, and whoever reads it will not stop there. He will read Pausanias and find every page lit up with a "light that never was on sea or land"—the glamour which invests forever all things that are Greek.

J. Irving Manatt.

The Empire and the Papacy (918–1273). By T. F. TOUT, M.A., Professor of History at the Owens College, Victoria University, Manchester. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1898. Pp. vii, 526.)

THE function of Mr. Tout among the writers in the Macmillan series of "Periods of European History" was to make a book of some five hundred pages on the period from 918, where Mr. Oman's volume ends, to 1273, where the next writer takes up the work. He desired, he says, in the absence of any sufficiently full existing text-book, to cover as much of the whole ground as his space allowed, but has in fact limited himself to narrating, with some amount of detail, the political and ecclesiastical history of Germany, France and the Eastern Empire. This is a very considerable programme and on the whole Mr. Tout has carried it out with fair success. The student will find in the twenty-one chapters a little something about almost everything. There are fourteen maps, showing in black and white the territorial divisions referred to in the text. There are ten genealogical tables, an appendix giving tables of rulers, references to literature and a sufficient index. What more can one ask in a text-book?

There are two ideals in the writing of text-books, either of which if carefully followed may produce good results. The book should be the overflow of the learning and insight of a thorough scholar or else it should grow naturally out of the need and experience of a successful teacher. The present volume corresponds to neither of these ideals. The author has evidently read a good deal in standard histories and in many of the most recent treatises on special epochs. He has profited by this reading so well that no one is likely to be led far astray by any of his presentations of fact. Yet at the same time one cannot feel that he has a mastery of his period which enables him to put the selected facts together in such a way as to give an impression of continuity or necessary relationship. He attempts a continuous narration, but there is no "go" in it. He is a victim of the desire to write flowing English, which is the bane of English historical book-makers. His style ambles withal, but the gait is monotonous to weariness. On one page we find five sentences introduced by "now." The number of clauses connected by "while" is beyond counting. This dreary monotony of style corresponds to the lack of color in the choice of what is to be told. Here is a typical passage: "Frederick II. was just twenty years old when the death of Innocent III. allowed him to govern as well as to reign. He was of middle height and well-proportioned, though becoming somewhat corpulent as he advanced in age. He had good features and a pleasant appearance. His light hair, like that of his father and grandfather, inclined toward redness, but he ultimately became very bald." Really our youth can do without this kind of thing, especially where space is precious.

Another legitimate demand on the modern text-book is that it shall lead the mind of the student out into larger fields of inquiry It must suggest vastly more than it says. Tried by this test Mr. Tout comes again very far short of what we may rightly expect. His bibliographical references, put in the form of occasional foot-notes, are too meagre to be of service to any one, and are of the most hap-hazard description. For example: the only works referred to about Hildebrand are Stephens (Epoch), Bowden and Villemain! Far better would be no bibliographies at all. There is hardly any suggestion of original sources. "Otto of Freising is a first-rate original chronicler" is almost the only reference of the kind. All names of books mentioned are without date of publication.

It is of course impossible for a book of this size to go into the endless controversies of special scholarship; but it may well bring some of them to the attention of students. It will thus avoid that fatal effect of knowing it all, which is so deadening to the mind of youth. This book does next to nothing of this work and loses thus one of its best opportunities. As an aid to the student in gaining a wider outlook the book is valueless.

We can have no quarrel with the due emphasis upon leading personalities, but such reference must be to things important in their effect upon the movement of history. We ought to be well beyond that conception of history which begot such phrases as "The king, enraged at," or "the duke, flushed with." Let us tell our students what happened and, in so far as we can, why it happened and what came of it, and be content if we can do that.

Almost every paragraph in the introduction suggests fruitful points of controversy, but we call attention only to the word "transition" and its questionable application to this period, which is marked, if ever any period was, by perfectly definable and persistent institutions. Unless we are to give up the word altogether, we must apply it where it belongs, to the period just preceding and to that just following the one here described. Those are transitions from something to something.

Township and Borough: being the Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford in 1897, together with an appendix of notes relating to the history of the town of Cambridge. By FREDERIC WILLIAM MAITLAND, LL.D. (Cambridge: The University Press. 1898. Pp. ix, 220.)

RESEARCH in the field of English municipal history has long been hampered by the need of good printed collections of town records and by the scarcity of scholarly monographs on the constitutional development of particular boroughs. Within the past ten or fifteen years a few well-edited volumes of records have appeared, but there has not yet been published a single complete and detailed history of any borough. Though there are probably more than a hundred thousand books on English local history, including works on counties, towns, manors, churches, etc., many of which contain valuable material, few of them furnish a good critical account of local institutions. For example, Cooper's *An-*

nals of Cambridge is mainly an abstract of local records, which the author of *Township and Borough* has turned to account. The contrast in the workmanship of these two books is striking. The one gives us annalistic notes, while the other traces the growth of institutional life. Professor Maitland has, in fact, rendered a distinct service by writing a book which should teach students of local history proper methods of investigation. If his work should stimulate the production of other monographs on particular towns, similar to his own or more comprehensive in scope, the task of the future historian who undertakes a general treatise on English municipal development will be greatly lightened. Indeed, until more has been accomplished in connection with the investigation of institutions in particular boroughs, a satisfactory history of English municipalities cannot be written.

Professor Maitland's main theme is the growth of municipal incorporation in Cambridge. He begins by emphasizing the rustic basis of this and other large boroughs. Such rusticity is visible throughout the Middle Ages and far into modern times. Even London still had its arable fields in the twelfth century, and many boroughs seem to have been greatly concerned about their agrarian interests at a much later time. The history of boroughs thus involves the study of fields and pastures. Since the thirteenth century there slowly emerges an important distinction between the borough community and the village community: the former is corporate, the latter is not. "Corporateness came of urban life." Modern writers, by overestimating the number of inhabitants in the villages, by eliminating the lord from consideration as a unifying element, and by underrating the automatic, self-adjusting scheme of the old agricultural system, have ascribed too much corporateness, too much collective ownership and governmental unity, to the village. The principle which originally served to mark off the borough from the village was the special royal peace conferred upon fortified places. The borough was, indeed, the centre of the shire for military, judicial, and commercial purposes: it was "the stronghold, the market, and the moot-stow of the shire." The king exercised lordship over the borough, which, however, was no royal manor; he was the lord, but not the manorial lord; many of the burgesses were dependent on other lords. With the development of commerce the burgesses ceased to be self-supporting agriculturists, though many of them continued to eke out a revenue derived from trade by growing a little grain in the fields. The land then became a mobile, saleable commodity: "the market has mobilized the land; the land is in the market." The proprietary scheme of the acre-strips ceased to have regularity and equality; they were no longer united into hides and virgates. The people of Cambridge gave more than half their land to religious houses in the twelfth and following centuries, and the rest passed rapidly from hand to hand by purchase. Land and houses were sold or bequeathed like chattels. Therefore mesne tenure lost its political importance, for the landlord was deprived of his right of escheat, and became simply a man with a rent-charge.

The last two lectures deal with the growth of municipal incorporation, especially in Cambridge. We are told that the *firma burgi* did not imply the corporate liability of the borough for the annual rent due to the crown, but that the bailiffs of the town were really responsible for its payment. Though all the burgesses were liable to the king, the bailiffs were expected to make good any deficit in the revenues which they collected to satisfy the fee-farm rent; if, on the other hand, they made a profit, they spent it in a common banquet or in a drinking-bout. Professor Maitland says that the main reason for allowing the burgesses to have the town at farm was to free the borough court from the sheriff's control. This statement may be correct, but it requires explanation, for there seems to be much evidence to show that the main advantage of this privilege was to free the burgesses from the sheriff's interference in fiscal matters. Was not the burghal moot, "the one old organ of the borough," under the control of the town officers long before *firma burgi* was granted to the burgesses? But this question does not affect the author's main line of thought. With his usual skill and learning he shows how the definite idea of corporate ownership of land appears in Cambridge about the middle of the fourteenth century, when bits of waste or "common" began to be leased by the borough. "The Town that seals leases, that takes rents, is becoming a person; it is ascending from the 'lower case' and demands a capital T." In modern times the corporation becomes "both *persona ficta* and a Tory dining club."

In the appendix, which forms more than half the volume, many matters of interest relating to Cambridge are ably investigated. The book as a whole deserves high praise. By looking "beyond wall and ditch to the arable fields and the green meadows of the town," Professor Maitland has broken new ground, and has done much to advance the study of municipal history.

CHARLES GROSS.

History of England under Henry the Fourth. By JAMES HAMILTON WYLIE, M.A. Vol. IV., 1411–1413. (London, New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co. 1898. Pp. x, 575.)

MR. WYLIE, in the preface to this his concluding volume, rather disarms criticism on those points which have met with such general disapproval in his former volumes by treating his work, notwithstanding its title, as principally intended to provide material for later historians. We can, therefore, only state our difference of opinion form his in the two points he defends, the desirability of such minute detail in a general history, and the realistic effect produced by including in his narrative a large number of strange contemporary words and expressions; and then pass on to a recognition of the various excellencies of his book. This last volume includes only about a hundred pages of text, all the remainder being given up to appendices, glossary, and index. The amount of new information is, therefore, naturally not great, but the account of the relations of England with the Hanse towns and the Teutonic Order is very interesting. Not that any conclusion to the current disputes was reached. On the contrary, the very impracticability of establishing any stable equilibrium throws much light on the rising ambitions of English traders, on the semi-independence of the English towns, and on the failing fortunes of the Hanse and the Order. When English merchants were fighting their way into all harbors in accordance with a manifest destiny to become world-traders, there was little probability that there would be a cessation of armed frays with traders of other nations who had long been used to a monopoly in these same harbors. So long as English merchant vessels had to arm and defend themselves, the merchants of English towns were not likely to pay to foreign claimants indemnity for their losses in these irregular combats, no matter how often they were so commanded by the King and Council.

In other chapters the detailed account of official events brings out clearly here, as it has in the earlier volumes, how continuous the friction with France was, how incomplete had been the suspension of the "Hundred Years' War." The campaign of Henry V., in 1415, was not a deliberate renewal of a closed-up war, but simply a repetition of recent expeditions, although, of course, more extensive, more deliberate, and more vigorous. The plans for a renewal had never been suffered to sleep by either side. We have next a discussion of the obscure estrangement between the King and the Prince of Wales during the King's last year, and of the stories of the Prince's youthful wildness. Mr. Wylie is inclined to give these stories more credit than they sometimes receive, though he rejects, of course, those of his participation in sportive highway robbery. A fuller discussion is given to the story of his committal to prison by the outraged chief-justice, and the author decides for the acceptance of it, though he acknowledges the absence of actual contemporary testimony.

A work that follows on the whole such a definite line of official history can hardly find much of a dramatic conclusion in the last days of Henry IV. Weakened and made repulsive in appearance by some strange wasting illness he gradually withdrew from his labors, fainted one day during his devotions in Westminster Abbey, and died in the adjoining "Jerusalem Chamber." The details that Mr. Wylie gives of the embalmment and burial of the king are interesting, but throw into relief the cyclopedic rather than historical character of the work. His last chapter, devoted to a careful summary of the personal appearance, character, and abilities of Henry, furnishes a somewhat depressing commentary on the method of writing history without any generalizations, any theories, or any outlook.

But the really serious part of this volume, as has been said, lies in the additions rather than in the narrative. The index covers the matter of all the four volumes and is of surpassing length, detail, and excellence. It covers more than two hundred pages, includes the notes as well as the text, and, in the peculiar method adopted by Mr. Wylie in his writing, furnishes the key to the value of the book. An enormous amount of accurate information and reference for almost all sides of English life in the early fifteenth century is here put at the command of scholars, and one almost feels ashamed of any criticism of the manner of writing a history when he sees the wealth of matter on which it is based, and realizes what a vast amount of labor is represented by its collection. The trust which the author expresses that the work of future historians will be lightened by his labors will certainly be justified. The same remarks are in a slightly less degree applicable to the glossary of rare and obsolete words. There are besides some thirty appendices of varying interest and value.

The variety and extent of the sources from which Mr. Wylie was drawing his information has been noticeable since the publication of the first volume. The principal bibliography, however, is in the second volume, the third containing only books not already mentioned, and this last volume including the list of manuscript sources, with extracts from some of them published as an appendix. These bibliographical lists are somewhat miscellaneous. Contemporary and later works are placed in the same list, although distinguished, not always quite accurately, by a sign. Again, some of the works cited are inclusive of others in the same list. Foreign and native writers are not distinguished. These defects in what is otherwise a remarkable bibliographical list call attention to the deficiencies in bibliographies generally. Reviewers have long made the lack of an index a matter of rebuke. But the bibliography is as a general thing the most slovenly part of even an excellent book. Frequently there is no bibliographical information whatever, as in Stubbs's *Constitutional History*. An uncritical unannotated list of all the books that have been examined or quoted is often all that is given in a book that may be far above the average of scholarly work. On the other hand there are few if any easier or more effective ways in which an author can help his successors in the same field. Lists are in general entirely too long. Many books have not a thing in them which is not included in some other book. It is pure waste to leave a second student to go laboriously through the two books to find this out. Bibliographical lists are too indiscriminate. Many books which a student has felt bound to examine he has found to be worthless. He ought to say so for the benefit of others. Secondary and primary sources should never be placed in such juxtaposition as to obscure the difference of their degree of authority. A short statement of contents or character, a few words of comment or criticism, some information about editions, accessibility, or reputation, would often be as valuable and interesting to those who read the book as they would be practicable and easy to the one who wrote it. These remarks are made not because Mr. Wylie is an especially great sinner in such respects, but because in every other way the equipment of his books is so excellent, and because his bibliographical material itself is so extensive and could readily have been made so useful.

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY.

The History of English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century. By G. P. GOOCH, M.A. (Cambridge: University Press. 1898. Pp. viii, 363.)

THIS work, the author says in his preface, is the first attempt yet made to relate the story of English democratic thinking in the seventeenth century, although intended "to do no more than direct attention to the salient points of the story." It contains an introduction and ten chapters, the introduction and first chapter forming a brief study of democratic thought prior to the seventeenth century.

The origin of the modern democratic idea appears in the mind of the author to lie wholly in the sixteenth century, and in the Reformation. It is difficult to accept this statement in its entirety, as it excludes all prior influences such as the rise of free cities, and, especially, all economic factors.

The relation of the Huguenot movement to the progress of democratic thought receives considerable attention and a valuable mass of material is indicated in the notes. As to the growth of democratic ideas in England before the seventeenth century (Chapter I.), we have a very satisfactory examination of Wyclif, of More, and of later writers like Poynet and Goodman, Knox and Buchanan.

The section on The Birth of Independency rightly judges of the importance and genius of the Brownist movement and suggests some new ideas as to Robert Brown's place in the whole agitation. Holland's place in the growth of independency, and the inoculation of English religious bodies with Dutch ideas and ideals are exceedingly well put. The chapter on New England is not entirely satisfactory. The influence of the New Plymouth colony on colonies subsequently founded is exaggerated, while the principle of criticism that ought to be applied to Massachusetts Bay is that its true influence is found not in its intention but in its result. In regard to Rhode Island and Roger Williams, the work shows a somewhat superficial treatment. In fact, New England and the English colonies as a whole had far greater influence upon the growth of democratic ideas than this account would indicate.

The section on The Eve of Revolution is the most spirited bit of writing in the book, but Mr. Gooch's treatment of Democratic Constitutionalism, and Presbyterianism and its Critics, in Chapter III., lacks clearness. Not so with the section on The New Radicalism which ends the chapter. It contains some admirable generalizations and a very accurate account of the effect of the many new religious sects upon democracy. The degree to which the millenarian idea had permeated all the radical sects, the junction of this idea with Antinomianism, and the relation of the Independents to the more radical of these religious sects is, perhaps, nowhere else so satisfactorily stated.

The chapter on the Political Opinions of the Army (Chapter IV.) is valuable both for the author's discussion and for the material collected and classified in the notes. The treatment of the Levellers and of Ireton is especially suggestive. One of the best portions of the book is the chapter devoted to The Antagonists of the Oligarchy, *i. e.*, the Levellers and Communists, the section on the latter being especially new and valuable.

In Cromwell's Political Principles we have nothing particularly new, yet the material is so arranged as to give, together with some previous paragraphs, a strikingly clear picture of the progress of the Protector's political thought; of his conservatism and his opposition to the doctrine of "The Law of Nature" in the agitation of 1645 and 1646; of the truth that "Oliver came very slowly to the knowledge of his abilities." In general, the estimate of Cromwell's relation to political thought is accurate, except that here again all economic considerations are left out.

There is in Chapter VIII. a very satisfactory examination of the new religious bodies—the Millenarians, the Baptists and the Quakers, and of their attitude toward the Protectorate. The close affiliation between the Baptists and the Quakers in the early stages of the Quaker movement is clearly shown.

On the whole, the book is a valuable addition to English historical writing, although it contains several portions that ought to be critically examined before their conclusions are accepted, and although it leaves economic considerations entirely out of view. It is stimulating to thought and the style is, on the whole, clear and spirited. The notes are short but abundant, point the way to a great mass of material, and form one of the best features of the book. This material which, although mostly known to students, has never before been grouped with reference to this subject, has been, in general, accurately sifted and critically used.

We should say, therefore, that the greatest value of the work lay in collecting in a fairly exhaustive way the original material on the subject; in sifting this material and in grouping it in correct proportion; and in correctly showing the sequence in, and relations between, the separate facts connected with the democratic thought of the seventeenth century.

FRANK STRONG.

La Formation de la Prusse Contemporaine. Par GODEFROY CAVAIGNAC. Tome Second: Le Ministère de Hardenberg, Le Soulèvement; 1808–1813. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1898. Pp. vii, 517.)

THE earlier volume of M. Cavaignac's work was devoted to the period of the ministry of Stein. Stein had laid out a scheme of reform which was designed to transform Prussia, but, like Turgot's reforms in France, this gained its chief importance rather from what it suggested of future possibilities than from what was actually accomplished by its author. To take up and in some measure complete Stein's reforms was the work of Hardenberg. M. Cavaignac finds that Hardenberg's policy embraced three chief points: to accomplish an economic revolution whereby individual effort should be emancipated, to substitute for the predominance of the great feudal holders the power of the middle classes, and to replace the system of "decentralized oligarchy" by a system of centralization on the French model. The present volume covers the period down to the middle of 1813. It includes, therefore, the reorganization of the Prussian military system which made the war of liberation possible.

Hardenberg found two great obstacles in his way, the feebleness and vacillation of the king, and the overzealousness of the patriotic party. The latter would have preferred an immediate national uprising against Napoleon to the slow process of building up the national strength with the idea of insuring the ultimate success of such an uprising. Frederick William III. was not the type of sovereign suited to a time so critical as that which followed Jena. In constant terror of Napoleon's disfavor on one side and of too great concessions to popular government on the other, he was a hindrance to both patriots and reformers.

Chapter II. deals with the reorganization of the national finances. The author demonstrates the falsity of the prevalent impression that these reforms were of a revolutionary character. They were rather an "adaptation" than a new creation. Much of inequality and special privilege remained, but it was from the privileged classes themselves that the principal opposition to the measures came. Curiously enough, too, a considerable section of the patriotic party opposed them because they were distinctly French in character.

Upon the question of representative government Hardenberg and Stein were in complete accord. Neither dreamed of weakening the royal authority. Stein recommended to Hardenberg the principles of Richelieu as a model,—certainly, as our author remarks, "a bad beginning for the establishment of the constitutional régime." The economic reforms for which both had been laboring had been directed against the old class distinctions, and yet now it was proposed to base whatever of national representation was to be established on those very distinctions. The national representative body was to be little more than an enlarged edition of the provincial estates, with three orders, the landed aristocracy, the burgher class and the peasantry. Its powers were to be only consultative and advisory. M. Cavaignac is writing from the point of view of a Frenchman, to whom the results of the Revolution even in its earlier phases come as a matter of course, and it is not strange that his attitude toward this extreme conservatism of the most advanced Prussian statesmen of that day is one of surprise and pity.

With the extreme patriotic party Hardenberg's relations were necessarily of a secret nature. Prussia's position in 1811 was a desperately critical one. The very existence of the state was endangered by the suspicions of Napoleon. The patriots had secret relations with England. Scharnhorst and Gneisenau were quietly carrying through those military reforms that were to make Prussia able at last to bid defiance to Napoleon. To this military reorganization M. Cavaignac devotes several chapters. He rightly appreciates the importance of the formation of the *Landwehr* as a military measure. But he sees in it a still higher significance, for it was also a "phenomenon of social discipline." In the study of this as of the other parts of his subject he has made a thorough use of the best authorities. He has not always deemed it necessary to go to the original sources for his facts, and has freely used the standard histories like those of Häusser, Lehmann and Droysen. In the appendix he has reproduced several original documents, mostly from French sources. The book is evidently one written with the purpose of making Frenchmen better acquainted with the formation of the state which, as their chief enemy, they ought to understand; but the author has not sacrificed either historical truth or historical perspective in carrying out this purpose.

ULYSSES G. WEATHERLY.

Modern France, 1789–1895. By ANDRÉ LEBON. [The Story of the Nations.] (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1898. Pp. ix, 488.)

IT is our impression that most readers will lay down this book with a sense of mild disappointment. The volume has a tasteful appearance, but the coarse board under the cloth is heavy, and in the new copy given by a friend to the reviewer had warped so as to split the cloth; the paper is heavily loaded, the plates, presumably new, already give a blurred impression of certain pages, and the illustrations—it is hard to imagine the service they have already rendered elsewhere. The text does not in any way compensate for the clumsiness and cheapness of the book. The translator has laboriously set down a verbal rendering of the original, and while the number of distinct Gallicisms is but small the entire contents are a witness to the truth of the Italian proverb, *Traduttore, Traditore.* A French author writing for his countrymen may go far on the road of condensation and generalization without becoming obscure, but among Englishmen and Americans it requires an expert in French history to grasp the sense of M. Lebon, as stated in many places among these pages. But we might put up with these drawbacks, with such phrases as "elective urn," "neorosis (*sic*) of the chambers," and "Nonjurant" wrested from its specific to a general meaning, with the "jurisdiction of juries," "superiority of guilty passion," "councils of discipline," "aureole of martyrdom," and other similar phrases, a harvest of which can be reaped throughout the book; from all such juxtapositions of words we might trust our mother-wit to get for us a vague meaning by means of the context, provided the labor and anxiety were worth while. But it is doubtful whether they are.

M. Lebon is probably a painstaking functionary; he appears also to be the ripe product of the over-charged programmes of the reorganized French colleges and universities. In fact on p. 365 he calls attention to his position, that of an active politician, as unfitting him for the task of a historian. He can only give "salient facts," he may not pronounce "circumstantial judgments" (whatever they may be), nor even enter into "chronological details," a more mysterious realm. The character of his work testifies not only to the perfect sincerity of this confession, but likewise to the intellectual training he has had. All told there are four hundred and sixty-two pages of text; exactly a third, a hundred and fifty-four pages, is given up to a catalogue of the French celebrities of the period, men and women famous in literature, art, science, medicine and every other department of human activity. Of each the erudite author has an estimate; longer or shorter, according to renown, but a final estimate given without hesitation. Such a range of critical activity is afforded to few. The truth is that terseness like this is nugatory, not to say misleading, and such a display of mere knowledge is utterly unhistorical.

Of the remaining three hundred and eight pages about two-fifths are occupied by writing which displays the essential vice of modern French life, namely, the criticism of the successive constitutions which throughout the epoch he essays to treat have been put on paper and inaugurated in practice, only to be rejected and discredited. M. Lebon's remarks are fair enough, but the proportion of space given to such considerations indicates that the hope of securing a constitution which by the magic of its working will remedy the evils of French life has not yet disappeared from the minds of French politicians. As they idealize their army into a superhuman power above criticism, so they still seek the ground of political stability in a paper of rights and regulations, in a theory as to the subdivision of powers, and as to an application of checks, balances, and regulations to administration. There will be no satisfactory political reformation in any people without an underlying social regeneration; unselfishness and loftiness of purpose may be furthered, but they cannot be created, by charters.

Finally, there remains the narrative of "salient facts." Concerning this it may be said that it must be read with caution. There are minor inaccuracies in the statements of facts and dates which may be passed over as slips due to haste. But it is distinctly misleading to say that "Bonaparte had recaptured Toulon," p. 39; that "the Directory allowed itself to be persuaded by its famous general" to undertake the Egyptian expedition, p. 63; that the revolt of "Romanticism against the philosophic spirit of the eighteenth century produced a religious revival," p. 259; that "the brute force of material interests" controls the direction of events, p. 259; that "the King of Prussia ordered his cousin to withdraw his candidature" to the Spanish throne, p. 335; or that "Liberals and simple Democrats alike were forced into opposition to the Church in order to deprive the reactionaries of their last refuge." These are but a few examples of how "salient facts" should not be stated; they are taken almost at hazard in turning the pages of the book.

But the careful reading of the book as a whole leaves more than discontent with details. Old France disappears, the Revolution begins, the Red Terror lifts its awful head, the organized demoralization of society appears in the Directory—all apparently without any causal nexus between social states, except that each suffered from a poor constitution. States of society succeed one another, thrones rise and fall, ministers appear and disappear, and we are left in darkness as to any sufficient reason, the author, as far as he is visible, being apparently a fatalist and pessimist, as he truly declares that most able Frenchmen are. We are told little or nothing about public opinion, except that on one occasion it was "nauseated," and about the great constructive elements which undoubtedly exist in the French life of the nineteenth century we get no adequate information at all. Of course there are some praiseworthy qualities in the effort of M. Lebon. He does not lose himself in details; he gives a useful outline of events in their sequence; he is fairly interesting. He may be a scientific thinker, and in his attempts to connect literature and life in their various phases there are indications that he has examined some questions with scientific curiosity. There prevails also in his work a sense of self-respect and a feeling of patriotism which command our admiration.

Geschichte Europas seit den Verträgen von 1815 bis zum Frankfurter Frieden von 1871. Von ALFRED STERN. Zweiter Band. (Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz. 1897. Pp. xvi, 572.)

THE first volume of Dr. Stern's history of Europe since 1815 appeared in 1894 and at once won its way to the favor of scholars. In this, the second volume, published last year, the author has continued the narrative from the year 1820 to the year 1825, and has not only fully maintained the standard already established, but all things considered, *me judice,* has given us results of even greater interest and merit than were those presented in the first volume. This is due partly to the fact that the period dealt with abounds in dramatic situations and incidents, partly to the greater unity of the subject, which tends to hold the attention of the reader, and partly to the increasing wealth of material of a personal character—letters and the like—which the author has utilized in writing his book.

Dr. Stern begins his volume with a careful and elaborate account of the Spanish revolution of 1820, passes to that of Portugal of the same year, and then, crossing the sea to Italy, takes up the earlier phases of the Neapolitan uprising. He then examines the circumstances attending the calling of the congresses of Troppau and Laibach, and with two valuable chapters on the diplomatic efforts of Metternich, the deliberations of the plenipotentiaries, and the results of their meetings, completes his study of the first phase of the general revolutionary movement in Europe. He next describes the Greek revolution, devoting altogether nearly a quarter of the book (125 pages) to the history of this subject from 1820 to 1825; and in the midst of his narrative, having brought the Grecian movement to the year 1822, returns to the Spanish revolt, works out the situation in France, and by this path come to the calling of the congress of Verona and the intervention of the French in Spain. At the close of this chapter he gives to the counter-revolution in Portugal a dozen pages, and then considers at length the reaction that followed the revolutions in Spain and Italy. Having completed this phase of his subject, the author turns northward, and for the first time engages himself with the history of Germany, touching but lightly the situation in the lesser states, and laying chief stress upon events in Prussia, the work of the various commissions on the constitution, and the final victory of the feudal element and the bureaucracy. At this point, in order to prepare the way for an intelligent discussion of England's influence upon the course of events in Greece, Dr. Stern devotes a chapter to the history of England. This finished, with the situation in the various countries well in hand (though no attempt is made to study Russian politics), the author continues the history of the Greek revolution to the death of Alexander I. and the disruption of the Holy Alliance. He closes his volume with a chapter on the movement in literature and an appendix of documents.

From this brief survey it will be seen that, notwithstanding the strictly chronological character of the treatment, there exists in the work a certain organic unity, which the first volume did not possess. This is due to the fact that the events of the period revolve about Metternich and the congresses, and that Dr. Stern has allowed this fact to determine the arrangement of his material. It is quite true that he discusses the political history of each state independently and in detail, yet inasmuch as the order of his topics is fixed by the course of events abroad, he leaves the impression that he is giving us the internal history of France and England, for example, not for the purpose of explaining the downfall of Richelieu and the policy of the Ultras, the trial of Queen Caroline and its political consequences, but rather that we may better understand the attitude of the countries toward the doctrine of intervention. And the method employed is justified in this volume by the solidarity of the European diplomacy of the period treated, and in the work as a whole by the fact that, written in large part from new and original material, it was necessary to construct it chronologically, line by line, even in every part. The work can never become a purely popular history; it is written in narrative fashion without any attempt at that philosophical or logical treatment which demands continuity, and is entirely free from personal comments, evidences of partisanship, and attempts at fine writing, such as make for shortness of life in an historical work.

In examining the material that Dr. Stern has employed, we find that it consists of letters, accounts, despatches and instructions of French, Prussian, Russian, Sardinian, Tuscan, and Austrian ambassadors, consuls-general, and special representatives; of the hitherto unpublished correspondence of prominent ministers and diplomatists, such as Metternich, Capodistrias, and Pasquier; of letters of royalty, of King Ferdinand of Naples and King Ferdinand of Spain, some of which are printed in the appendix. It is worthy of note that Dr. Stern records no material from the English archives. By means of the evidence thus obtained and with the aid of some recently published memoirs and monographs, the author has been able to cast new light upon the doings of congresses and the motives of statesmen, to overthrow legends, to supplement memoirs or throw doubt upon them, and in a number of instances to correct errors in the writings of other historians. Note, for example, what he says regarding the legends that have clustered about the youth of Charles Albert, pp. 71, 72, 379; his use of new material to supplement or correct Baumgarten's history of Spain, pp. 20, 35, 119; and the wealth of new evidence that he has obtained for the study of the congresses of Troppau and Laibach and especially of Verona, pp. 129, 151, 292, 572. Some of these documents he had previously made accessible to scholars by publishing them in various journals, as Dalberg's draft of a constitution for Piedmont (1820) in *Rivista Storica del Risorgimento Italiano;* Strassoldo's letters to Metternich in the *Zeitschrift für Social- und Wirthschaftsgeschichte;* Hardenberg's memoir upon the Prussian constitution and Metternich's Troppau-memoir in the *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte;* and others in the *Revue Historique* and *Historische Zeitschrift.* The appendix to the present volume contains a number of valuable documents, and one can only wish that Dr. Stern would edit a collection of sources and so make accessible a larger number of the documents that he himself has used.

Dr. Stern does not often express personal judgments, but when he does he is usually happy. Brief comments upon Metternich after Laibach (p. 180), upon the death of Richelieu (p. 265), upon Chateaubriand at Verona (p. 297), and upon the death of Hardenberg (pp. 385–386) show his skill in brief, epigrammatic character-drawing. Generally, however, he is content to let us judge the personality of the men of whom he treats by the work that they accomplished. He has eliminated himself and his own opinions almost entirely from his work; yet he is always interesting, because his method is simple, his treatment scholarly, his statements accurate. His work is attractive, not for its style, its literary qualities, its brilliant word-painting, or its tricks of presentation; it is simply narrative history suggestively and impartially presented.

To complete the work at the present rate of progress will require more than thirty years in addition to the six or more already consumed. Dr. Stern has set for himself an enormous task, and the thought of Lanfrey, Sybel, Freeman, and others who have died in the harness is sure to arise and to make us wish for the author the blessing of a long life. But time and health are not the only desiderata; material is equally necessary. Access to official documents, which Dr. Stern has thus far used with such admirable judgment, will become more and more difficult as he advances in the century, for the European governments—except Prussia, and now alas! no longer Prussia,—have hitherto rigidly shut the door against any scientific treatment of recent history, and have forbidden the publication, except with the official *imprimatur,* of state papers concerning the last half-century. Time may remedy this and Dr. Stern may find the doors opening as he advances and may be able to utilize the archival material for the later period with the same success as he has the earlier. If this should prove to be the case, the reader may well be content with the slowness of the publication.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission of the American Historical Association, 1896. [Ext. from the Report of the American Historical Association for 1896.] (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1897 [1898]. Pp. 463–1107.)

IN 1895 the Executive Council of the American Historical Association appointed an Historical Manuscripts Commission to edit, index, or collect information in regard to unprinted documents relating to American history. Professor Jameson, who had for several years advocated and worked for the establishment of such a body, was fitly made chairman. The other members of the Commission as originally appointed were Mr. Douglas Brymner, Mr. Talcott Williams, and Professors Trent and Turner. The first Report of the Commission is now before the public. The main part of this report consists of six parcels of hitherto unpublished material, five of which vividly illustrate the political feeling and methods, the economic wants and interests of the principal divisions of the country in the formative period of our nation-life, 1783–1800. The remaining parcel contains some intercepted letters purporting to be written by an officer in the English army in 1756 to the Duke de Mirepoix proposing to betray the English interests in the West to the French if the necessary money is provided. These documents seem to me the least valuable in the Report. Mr. Brymner in his introduction is very non-committal on the question of their authenticity. "These and other facts," he says, "give a greater color of probability to the authenticity" of these letters. Although I have not studied them closely enough to venture a very positive opinion, I am inclined to think they are merely, in the words of Halifax, "an artifice to draw a little money from France." The bragging tone and the inconsistencies in the narrative arouse one's suspicions. The complete uncertainty of any fact alleged in these letters that is not elsewhere confirmed makes their value slight at best. Halifax conjectured that the writer was an Irishman because the spelling seems to indicate an Irish pronunciation. Professor Jameson has arrived at the same conclusion. It seems to me, however, that the French idioms in the writer's English indicate that he was a Frenchman who had acquired a good command of colloquial English, but who was not secure from an occasional lapse to native forms of expression. If he learned his English from Irishmen the peculiarities of his spelling are accounted for. On the other hand, the French idioms are of a kind that no foreigner would acquire. For example, p. 664, "I've some time ago, been very ill used by the English Governours here have within these 15 days, been solicited to be at the head of a considerable army," etc. The use of "15 days" instead of "fortnight" seems to me an almost convincing indication that the writer was thinking partly in French or else that the present text is a translation of a French original. Cf. this phrase on p. 671, "a few days ago, there has been at New York a Congress."

The contrast between the baffling vagueness of these letters and the throbbing life of those relating to the plan of the French Republic in 1792–3 to recover Louisiana and to revolutionize the Spanish colonies is striking. In these documents, partly derived from the Draper collection in the possession of the Wisconsin Historical Society and partly copied for the Commission from the originals in the French Archives we see well-known historical characters working at a train of events of enormous possible consequence, too vast, in fact, for the means at the disposal of the conspirators. On one side it is the prelude to Napoleon's recovery of Louisiana and the cession of it to the United States, and, in another aspect, the prelude to Burr's conspiracy. As the Revolutionary committee on legislation laid the solid foundations of the Code Napoleon, so the origin of Napoleon's Louisiana policy is traced back beyond Talleyrand to the earlier days of the Revolution, to Brissot and the unknown author of the "*Plan proposé pour faire une révolution dans la Louisiane*" who tells us that he had tried in 1787 to interest the old government in the project.

Professor Turner's able study of the origin and development of this great design in the July number of the REVIEW precludes any extended comment on the new facts disclosed by these documents, but one or two remarks may be ventured. In regard to Genet's mission, it is not too much to say, that the accounts of it in our histories and lectures must be entirely reconstructed. Hitherto we have missed the essential and momentous elements, and made merry or become sarcastic over the indiscretions and impertinences of the youthful French minister. Again in these letters the old truth that only steam transportation has made a permanent union of the states possible receives new and vivid illustration. With both Frenchmen and Westerners it seems an accepted fact that nature designed the Mississippi valley for a political unit; that its interests were too diverse and that it was too remote from the coast states to find in union with them the fulfillment of its destiny; and that the working of those same forces which two generations later made inevitable the failure of the South to divide this unit and to establish a new power in control of the lower waters of the Mississippi, was destined to wreck the Spanish power on the Gulf. So both Frenchmen and Westerners vie with each other in uging on the crisis and in preparing to seize the fragments. The plot unfolds itself with dramatic intensity, and one cannot help a twinge of disappointment at its collapse. The story, too, is not without its humor, as may be seen from the delicious Wellerism of old De Pauw in his account of the untimely end of La Chaise, one of the conspirators. "But he has meet with the unhappy corcimstance of Lossing his existence, by the parting of his head from his body, by the gallouttinne under the name of gonbo Lachase which name he bor in franch before by coming from the mississippie, which is the name of a dich made in that country (Our)inds all lachase Exploys." When I add that this worthy's French was hardly more literate than his English, the reader will second the suggestion that the editor might now and then have permitted himself to provide a gloss to smooth or hasten our progress. Take for example this sentence, p. 980. "ses habitans sont en general bons soldats et j'ateste quil mobien de fois communiquer qui ferons tout leur possible de bouleverser le gouvernement espagnole."

The selections from the communications which Phineas Bond, the British consul to the Middle States, sent to his home authorities, give us a valuable picture of our critical period. Bond, formerly a Loyalist of the higher type, now doubly devoted to the mother country through persecution, reveals the breaches that natural commercial interests were making in the old colonial system. He records with no little apprehension the migration of British artisans, the surreptitious importation of machinery, and the beginnings of that China trade which brought so much wealth to Massachusetts, and which was for a time almost the only resource of her merchants after independence had shut us out from the British system. The demoralizing effects of the revolutionary war, the profound commercial depression which followed, and the alarm as to the future in the minds of all thoughtful citizens are vividly depicted by this not unfriendly observer.

That the formation and adoption of the Constitution is to be viewed as a conservative reaction from the Revolution is enforced as clearly in the letters of the Boston merchant Stephen Higginson as it is in those of the British consul. In both, also, the economic historian will find useful material and effective illustrations. For the student of politics these Higginson letters deserve a place beside the Wolcott correspondence as a mirror of New England Federalism.

A companion picture of South Carolina politics early in this century is presented in the selections from the diaries of Edward Hooker, who, after his graduation from Yale, spent several years in the South as teacher. Among the interesting features of this diary are the reports of the discussions in the legislature on the suppression of the slave trade, the accounts of the prevalent venality of offices, of electioneering, of the duplicate voting in different counties by the large landholders, and the observations on the population. We think of South Carolina as having a fairly homogeneous white population, but to this Connecticut youth in 1805 the people of the state seemed as heterogeneous a mixture of foreigners as is now to be found in one of our western farming states.

Too high praise cannot be given for the thorough and scholarly manner in which these documents have been prepared for publication by the editors, Professor Jameson and, for the Genet-Clark papers, Professor Turner. The introductions are models of their kind, conveying in concise form the essential information for an adequate appreciation of each document. The editors' notes are equally painstaking and excellent. Other valuable features of the *Report* are the index of documents relating to the Genet-Clark expedition, the calendar of Stephen Higginson's correspondence so far as published in the *Report* or elsewhere, and the extremely useful "List of Printed Guides to and Descriptions of Archives in the United States and Canada" which was prepared under the editor's suggestion by Dr. E. C. Burnett of Brown University. Altogether this first report is one in which the Commission may justly take pride, and for which historical students will be warmly grateful. The Commission has proved its usefulness in the most convincing manner, and its future publications will be awaited with lively interest.

In closing, I should like to urge the publication of future reports in separate volumes. This entire report, comprising nearly 650 pages, is crowded into Vol. I. of the current *Report of the Historical Association* as Art. XXI. That tome is thereby swollen to the dimensions of a dictionary. If the Report of the Manuscripts Commission had been printed in a volume by itself, like Professor Ames's prize essay, it would have presented a better appearance and have been more convenient to use.

EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE.

The Voyages of the Cabots; Latest Phases of the Controversy. By SAMUEL EDWARD DAWSON, Litt.D. (Laval). [From the Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada for 1897.] (Ottawa: James Hope and Co. 1897. Pp. 130, 3 maps.)

John and Sebastian Cabot; The Discovery of North America. By C. RAYMOND BEAZLEY, Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1898. Pp. xx, 311.)

Cabot's Discovery of North America. By G. E. WEARE. (London: Macqueen. 1897. Pp. xi, 343, 12 maps and plates.)

IT is not easy for one living far from the fields of strife to appreciate the passionate bitterness of disagreement, which has characterized much of the recent discussion of the historical problems associated with the careers of John and Sebastian Cabot. At Oxford, apparently, according to a communication in the *English Historical Review* for January last, Mr. E. J. Payne has been subjected to "odium and some coarse personal vituperation" for holding certain curious notions which continue to be contrary to the received opinion. In Newfoundland and Eastern Canada, the Cabot landfall controversy has raged with terrible earnestness, of which a faint after-glow is discernible on the pages of Dr. Dawson's review of the latest phases of the discussion.

In 1894, Dr. S. E. Dawson of Ottawa prepared for the *Transactions* of the Royal Society of Canada an elaborate treatise, in which he undertook to establish the location of the spot whereon English feet first trod the soil of North America. Mr. Harrisse of Paris had previously shown, with great learning, that every sixteenth-century map which offers any information upon this subject, with a single exception, describes Labrador as the country discovered by Englishmen from Bristol. This discovery was made by Cabot in 1497, and there are three or four documents dated in that year, which contain everything which is now known with certainty in regard to what was actually accomplished by him. The data embodied in these documents prove conclusively that the newly found land was markedly different in every noticeable respect from the inhospitable coasts of Labrador. Having thus shown the impossibility of a Labrador landfall Dr. Dawson next discovered that a mere assumption of probability is the only basis for the claims on behalf of Newfoundland, upon whose shores it had been supposed for more than two hundred years that the English voyager westward-bound might most naturally find his first landing-place. Continuing his studies, Dr. Dawson found that the descriptions of the landfall, as reported by Cabot, applied perfectly well to the country of Cape Breton.

A statement which is said to have been authorized by Sebastian Cabot mentions an island of St. John lying over against the landfall. An island of this name appears on many early maps, and Dr. Dawson published a series of tracings and sketches from these, which enabled him to produce a very strong presumption that the original of this island lay in the position of the present Scatari Island, off the easternmost point of Cape Breton. Confirmation for the theory thus established, that this point was Cabot's landfall, appeared to Dr. Dawson to be found on the only extant map of the fifteenth century which shows the American coast—the well-known La Cosa chart, of which an admirable half-size facsimile accompanies Dr. Dawson's latest paper. The theory that "the discovered cape" noted on this map represents Cape Breton, and that the adjacent English flags mark the southern coast of Newfoundland, seems to be somewhat more probable than are various other theories that it represents various other points on the North American coast. Another map, published before the middle of the sixteenth century, offers the clearest evidence in support of the Cape Breton landfall. This engraved map carries a statement that Sebastian Cabot made it in 1544, and it shows against Cape Breton a legend calling this the First Land Seen, which a marginal reference explains as meaning seen by John Cabot. This famous Cabot mappemonde, of which there is also an excellent large facsimile in the latest volume of the Royal Society of Canada, unfortunately raises more problems than it solves, and Dr. Dawson acted most wisely in establishing his case as best he could without its help.

In 1896, Dr. Dawson replied briefly to those who had expressed their inability to find conviction in his earlier essay, and now in his *Latest Phases* he has published an elaborate treatise upon those who continue to disagree with him. The value of his paper as an index to the spirit with which the controversy is being conducted in Canada, has been referred to already. Other excrescent features of the argument are treated by Dr. Dawson's principal opponent, in another part of this REVIEW. Stated briefly, the landfall question as it now stands, is this: Residents of the United States having made no serious claim that the spot lay within their territory, we may assume that it must have been somewhere on the Canadian coast. As for the exact location, Dr. Dawson has presented a much stronger argument in favor of Cape Breton than has yet been made for any other claimant. The important fact remains unchallenged, out of all this much-belabored controversy, that English sailors landed on North America in the early summer of 1497.

It is unfortunate that Dr. Dawson took the landfall as the dominating theme for his Cabot studies. His writings reveal a power of historical perception, a command of the conditions essential to the solving of historical problems, and a capacity for conscientious study, combined with some literary skill, which ought to have produced a most valuable account of the Cabots and their achievements. All the material for such an essay is set forth in his three monographs. Nowhere else can be found a more satisfactory statement of the various problems which make up the story of their English career. What still remains to be written is a clear, conservative, well-balanced, scholarly account of what is known and what may be surmised about the Cabots and the English discovery of America. Perhaps Mr. Beazley of Oxford might have written such an account. The conditions under which his contribution to Cabot literature appears to have been produced, however, made this impossible. The Cabot quadricentennial gave wide publicity to the following supposition: "that North America is now so largely occupied by an English-speaking population, with all their vast energies and accumulated wealth, has been largely owing to the daring genius of Cabot." At about the same time, somebody projected a series of biographies, of three hundred odd pages each, of "The Builders of Greater Britain." Of course, a life of Cabot was forthwith ordered. Very luckily, the task was entrusted to a most competent man, with the result that this book is quite the most sensible thing that has been published about the Cabots since the appearance of Mr. Charles Deane's essay in the *Narrative and Critical History of America*. The difference between the two is that Mr. Deane found seven pages amply sufficient for all that he had to say in the shape of a connected account of the Cabots, whereas Mr. Beazley has endeavored to fill 263 pages with a narrative of this same sort. As in other Cabot volumes, bulk is secured by introducing into the narrative the text of original documents, upon which all scholarly opinions on the subject must of course be based. Mr. Beazley's only fault is that he does not distinguish frankly between a serious critical study of these documents, and a popular narrative intended to interest and instruct the intelligent public of Greater Britain. The work, as he has done it, is thoroughly satisfactory. The translations which he prints are in nearly every case his own versions from the original texts, and, as already suggested, his comments and interpretations are conservative, careful, and sensible beyond precedent in recent Cabotian discussions.

Mr. G. E. Weare is an authority upon the antiquities of the English Bristol. Perhaps this is the reason why, when he published a book about Cabot, it aroused the prejudices of nearly every well-known student of the subject, with the result that it has failed to receive such honest critical notice as it may justly claim to deserve. Much of what has been said about this book, moreover, has been so manifestly unfair and untrue, that a disinterested statement of one or two points is only the part of fair play. Mr. Weare's book is doubtless in many respects very bad. He filled up a volume about the Cabots; of necessity he appropriated a great deal of material from the works of other men, and in many cases he does not specify whence he copied. This practice, if one may judge from Mr. Beazley's book, does not seem to be regarded as a fault at the English universities. Mr. Weare printed the texts of documents which had been published elsewhere,—but where he could do so in London, he verified these texts, and in several cases his book contains a text more closely corresponding to the original manuscript than is elsewhere to be found in print. He also verified the translations which he copied, and both Dr. Dawson and, unwittingly, Mr. E. J. Payne have called attention to cases in which Mr. Weare has improved upon the versions of previous translators. Mr. Weare also published, for the first time, an interesting document recording the payment of John Cabot's pension, and he gave an exact reference to the place where the manuscript might be found. In another part of his book, he translated this document, and because he neglected to repeat the reference, some very harsh things have been said about him. In short, Mr. Weare's book is a useful repository of the Cabot documents, which may be consulted there, in their original languages and in English, more conveniently than anywhere else. Well-equipped students will continue to reply upon the more scholarly, and more expensive, volumes of Harrisse and of Markham, whenever they wish to examine these documents. They will also recognize with pleasure the efforts of every other student who succeeds in adding, however slightly, to the accuracy and the exhaustiveness of the work done by these masters of learning and of scholarship.

George Parker Winship.

The First Republic in America; an account of the Origin of this Nation, written from the records then (1624) concealed by the Council, rather than from the Histories then licensed by the Crown. By Alexander Brown, D.C.L. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Co. 1898. Pp. xxiv, 688.)

This book may be considered as constituting the third volume of the *Genesis of the United States* by the same author, published in 1890. It utilizes the valuable documents arranged chronologically in that work, and other papers, some of which have been found by the author since its publication. Many of these documents have not been accessible to the public before Dr. Brown commenced the arduous task of search for them. The result of his labor has been an invaluable addition to our knowledge of the history of the Virginia Colony, the pioneer of English occupancy of North America. Not the least interesting part of Dr. Brown's work is the publication of the correspondence between the King of Spain and his minister at London, relative to the settlement at Jamestown, the minister urging the throttling of the infant colony, and the King anxious that it be destroyed, yet taking no decisive step to that end, hoping that it would be abandoned because of the difficulties surrounding it. And well might Catholic Spain have exerted herself to prevent the English from obtaining a foothold in America, with their Protestant principles, civil and religious. English occupancy has proved to be Spanish exclusion; and the proud nation, once so rich and powerful, because of her American possessions, now, stripped of them, is so weak that there is little left to her beside her pride and her medieval ideas. No author has given so just an account of Spain's attitude towards the Virginia colony nor pictured with such minuteness the difficulties which attended its birth and infant growth. Through twenty years of its history the author has been able to trace the government of the colony under the original charter of 1606, and the subsequent charters of 1609 and 1612, and to relate the growth of the feeble settlement planted in 1607, into the self-sustaining community of 1624, when the King supplanted the authority of the Virginia Company of London, and took the government into his own hands. Now that the English dominate North America, every incident of this early history is of great interest, and the author has not omitted anything, however seemingly unimportant, which he considered authentic. He has thus taken 652 pages to relate the history of twenty years. It is safe to say that no library of American history can be considered complete without the publications of Dr. Brown, and no student of that history can afford to neglect their study.

With this estimate of the real worth of Dr. Brown's volumes, the reader will be pained to discover the deficiencies of an author, who has shown such commendable zeal in collecting and arranging original matter, but at the same time has shown himself wanting in some of the essential qualities of an historian. It has been well said of an historian, *nequid non veri audeat*, *nequid veri non audeat*. The great task for an historian therefore is the ascertainment of truth, which when once found he dare not conceal and be true to his calling. Where there have been parties to the transactions, making counter statements, the evidence on both sides must be weighed with judicial fairness. Dr. Brown states this more than once in his text, yet he has professedly written a history from *ex parte* testimony, entirely disregarding the statements of those members of the company, and colony, whose testimony has heretofore been accepted as true. He tells us on his title-page, that his book is "an account of the origin of this nation, written from the records then (1624) concealed by the council, rather than from the histories then licensed by the crown." He treats as false the histories of John Smith and the Rev. Samuel Purchas, published in 1624 and 1626, and the writings of the colonists on which they were based, and will have none of them. In fact he treats these authors, and those they followed, as enemies of the colony, though among them were men who ventured their money and lives in making it a success, and whose only difference with their colleagues, was as to the proper management of the enterprise. But Dr. Brown could not confine himself to the records of the Virginia Company, concealed by the council at London, and write a history of the years previous to 1619, for we have scant account of these records previous to that date. He therefore uses the publications of the company, made from time to time, which he is forced to confess are not reliable, as their object was to encourage emigration to Virginia, and they therefore often conceal the miserable state of the colony. This concealment was in accordance with the policy declared in the instructions given to the first colonists sent in 1607, in these words, "Suffer no man to return but by passport from the President and Council, nor to write any letters of anything that may discourage others."

Again, Dr. Brown states that his object is to show that the colonization of Virginia was begun and conducted with the noble purposes of Christianizing the Indians, enlarging English commerce, and founding an English commonwealth in which should exist civil and religious liberty. He dwells often, and at great length, on the establishment of free institutions in the colony by the company, and he has named his book *The First Republic in America.* A proper study of the subject as shown even in this volume, leads us to the conclusion, that so far as the London Company were concerned these noble purposes, if ever generally entertained, soon resolved themselves into one, and that was the planting of a colony for the purpose of commerce, and that commerce to be monopolized by the company, even to the oppression of the colony. The author does not pretend that any great effort was made to Christianize the Indians, previous to the massacre of 1622, and after that treacherous act no mercy was shown them, and the whites, in modern phrase, considered that the only good Indians were dead Indians. As to religious liberty, we find no effort to relax the strict requirements of the established church in England, which were imposed upon the colony from the beginning, and toleration came long afterwards, and when it could not be longer withheld.

As to civil liberty, Dr. Brown has made a remarkable blunder, which is imbedded in the very name of his book. The colonists by their charters were guaranteed the civil rights of Englishmen, but they never in fact enjoyed them in full measure during the period of which Dr. Brown writes, and Virginia was not during any part of that time a republic. A republic is a state in which the supreme power is vested in representatives chosen by the people. This was never the condition of the colony of Virginia. During the existence of the Virginia Company of London, that company governed the colony, appointed its officers and gave it its laws. Even after the allowance of a representative legislative body in Virginia in 1619, the acts of that body were of no force until approved by the council in England, which still appointed the governor and council in Virginia, parts of the legislative body. The granting of that assembly was a great advance in the development of free institutions in Virginia, it is true, but it did not constitute Virginia a republic. Neither did the incorporation of the London Company in 1612, with power to govern the Virginia colony without interference from the Crown, except in matters touching the state, make the colony a republic. Indeed the government of the colony by the London Company afterwards, was much more despotic than it had been under the first charter, when the company was controlled by the King; for then the council in Virginia had the privilege of choosing its own president, who was the governor. All this appears of necessity in Dr. Brown's book, for he could not entirely suppress the administrations of Gates, Dale, and Argall, nor the bitter complaints of the colonists, as shown even in papers issued by the assembly. We have to look further north for the first republic in America.

The key to Dr. Brown's serious mistakes in the very frame-work of his volume, is his bitter hostility to Captain John Smith, and his determination to brand as false every statement made by him, or in his praise, touching his conduct in Virginia. Of the twenty-three pages of his preface he devotes some twenty to violent abuse of Smith, and he never mentions him in the text without a flat contradiction, or an insinuation of dishonesty, or a sneer. Smith stated that the colony was better managed under the first charter than under the second and third, and he favored the renewal of the royal control which was effected in 1624. He was not singular in this. Many members of the company, and nearly all of the colonists, agreed with him, and the result justified them. But Dr. Brown, who fancies that the colony was a republic under the second and third charters, denounces Smith as an enemy of the colony, and is utterly unable to accord him any credit for his services in Virginia. These services have heretofore been held to have been valuable by historians, even by those who have discredited some of Smith's statements.

It would be easy, though tedious, to follow Dr. Brown in his frequent attacks upon Smith, and expose his injustice. But this must be reserved for another time. It need only be said here, that both Smith and Purchas wrote from ample contemporaneous authorities, existing before the differences arose in the London Company which caused its dissolution. And it may be added, that to have expected a company in London to continue to have the civil government over a colony in America growing into a state, would have been absurd in the extreme.

WM. WIRT HENRY.

A Quaker Experiment in Government. By ISAAC SHARPLESS, President of Haverford College. (Philadelphia: Alfred J. Ferris. 1898. Pp. 280.)

THE "Quaker Experiment" of which President Sharpless treats in this little volume—a monograph it must fairly be called—is that endeavor to establish civil government on ethical principles which William Penn, in his letter to James Harrison, August 25, 1681, termed "an Holy Experiment," and which he ardently hoped he might then find room for in America, though not in England. The experience of seventy-five years, from the summer of 1681, when Markham, provided with Penn's commission, reached the banks of the Delaware, and notified the Duke of York's officials of the change of authority, down to the summer of 1756, when the followers of Penn withdrew under compulsion from further control of the colony—this experience it is upon which President Sharpless has written this intelligent and fair-minded essay. Its merits may not be appreciated, perhaps, for the book is in every way modest—in style, in dimensions, in print, even in binding—but it is a valuable piece of advice which we here present to those who care to be well informed concerning the colonial period in Pennsylvania, to get it, and read it through.

The plan of Penn and his associates, when they formed their government of Pennsylvania in 1682, was not merely democratic, but ethical, and on both accounts they raised up embittered enemies, who in the end prevailed against them. The fullness of power accorded the people, in the assembly, was always offensive in England, and even Thomas Penn—a son of the founder indeed, but much removed in temper and opinion—did not hesitate to say in 1760 (in a letter to Governor Hamilton), that he had "no disregard" for the Friends, *except* "on their leveling Republican system of government." But it was on its ethical side that the Quaker experiment most invited attack. It proposed complete religious liberty. But that would give equal rights and opportunities to Jews and Papists! It proposed to deal fairly with the Indians. But that would starve out the land-grabbers and the dishonest traders. It proposed to be peaceable, and indulged the hope that thus peace would be maintained. But in such a system where was the place for the professional fighting man, or the opportunity for him to get "glory," or acquire plunder and prizes? It proposed a simple and strictly administered government. But that would cut out sinecures, and soft and easy places for "younger sons." Moreover, it proposed temperate and orderly living. What community could long tolerate that without rebellion? Because thou art virtuous, said Sir Toby Belch to Malvolio, dost thou think there shall be no more cakes and ale?

Under all the attacks which it thus invited, the Quaker experiment ultimately went down. We cannot say it failed; it was headed off. It did not come to an end; it was "side-tracked." In its high ideal of 1682 it could not and did not permanently continue. The strict code of conduct, Puritanism refined, of the "Great Law" of 1682, was not long strictly enforced, though the social condition of the colony was always exceptionally temperate, orderly, and humane. The complete religious equality first accorded was impaired about the end of the century, under pressure from England, and tests excluding others than orthodox Protestants were exacted from members of the assembly and all civil officers.

But above all it was the peace policy of the Friends which most excited derision and anger. If the impression prevails amongst many English-speaking people, professing Christians, at the end of the nineteenth century, that fighting is normal, and the intervals of peace only periods of "preparation" for the next war, what could have been the common view at the end of the seventeenth? The realization by those who watched them that Penn's colonists were actually endeavoring to avoid a military system and a war equipment, that they conceived there was really "no need for arsenals or forts," drew down upon them contempt from every quarter. Upon all the lines of argument which seemed reasonable to ordinary men, it could be demonstrated that such an experiment in government must fail. "Of all Friendly ideas," says President Sharpless, "the most difficult to incorporate practically into government machinery was that of peace," and this statement must be accepted with the fullest emphasis and significance that the language will bear. It *was* the most difficult; it is even now the most difficult, nearly a century and a half after the day the Friends surrendered their control of the Pennsylvania assembly.

The demand that the colony should arm itself, should "provide a militia," should furnish troops for the King's service, came with the English Revolution. The official news that James the Second was succeeded by William and Mary reached Philadelphia at the beginning of October, 1689, and the dispatch containing it stated also that His Majesty had ordered "all necessary preparation for a speedy war with the ffrench king." Such orders the governor, that testy formalist, Captain John Blackwell, called on the assembly to respect, and the assembly, compelled to make an answer, then and later formulated the principles upon which the Friends endeavored to direct, and as a matter of fact, did direct, Pennsylvania's action in relation to such demands from the crown, down to their resignation of control in 1756. These principles were: (1) That the governor, being under the terms of Penn's charter captain of the military forces, was *ipso facto* empowered to organize troops, if he considered them necessary; (2) that there were available to him, for such purposes those citizens who did not entertain the scruples of Friends concerning war; (3) that the assembly would vote money, to the extent which in their judgment the colony could afford "for the King's use." What that use might be His Majesty would decide. If he spent the money for war, he and not the assembly was accountable.

It cannot be said that this system did not answer fairly well for many years. The exigencies of Captain Blackwell's time were gotten over, Colonel Fletcher's arbitrary rule of two years was endured, the follies and futilities of young Governor Evans passed by, and then the treaties of Utrecht and the policy of Walpole gave the English colonies, with the mother country, a long breathing-spell of peace, and the unmilitary community on the Delaware prospered and grew. "Notwithstanding all difficulties and imperfections," says President Sharpless, justly, "there was for seventy years an efficient government in Pennsylvania, based largely on Penn's ideas. There were no wars or external troubles. The home affairs were quiet and orderly. Prosperity and contentment reigned, immigrants came in unprecedented numbers, and the public finances were so managed as to encourage trade, and lay no unnecessary burdens. Peace and justice were for two generations found available defenses for a successful state." The colony had, indeed, the service of able and intelligent men. The speakers of the assembly, men like Joseph Growdon, Edward Shippen, David Lloyd, Andrew Hamilton, John Kinsey, and Isaac Norris, made a group of colonial statesmen inferior to none under the English flag in America, for the work assigned them. Their strength was fully equal to any local strain which the maintenance of an orderly government in their own province might have put upon them, however unequal it was to meet a three-fold attack from disaffected elements in their own population, from hostile critics in other colonies, and from the organizers of war in the mother country.

President Sharpless observes with truth that "no one can appreciate the history of Colonial Pennsylvania who does not understand the spirit, the methods, and the beliefs of the Society of Friends. The failure to grasp these firmly, the dependence upon public records exclusively for the materials of history, has been the cause of serious misjudgments." His own work is fair-minded and straightforward, and while he puts himself naturally and readily into the place of those who endeavored the Quaker commonwealth, he deals with his subject in a spirit of simple candor which the reader cannot but recognize and enjoy.

Howard M. Jenkins.

American History told by Contemporaries. Edited by Albert Bushnell Hart, Professor of History in Harvard University. Vol. II., Building of the Republic, 1689–1783. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1898. Pp. xxi, 653.)

Probably the universal judgment would be that the period of Professor Hart's first volume is much richer in interesting materials of the sort which he is seeking to make known to students than that covered in the present volume. By comparison with the age of discovery and settlement and the days of Puritan enthusiasm, these ninety-four years, and especially the first seventy of them, were a dry time; the world was its own god, and Sir Robert Walpole was its prophet. Yet Professor Hart has attacked his new problem with so much force and enterprise and ingenuity that it is doubtful whether he has not made the second volume more interesting even than the first. The interest is of a different kind, to be sure. The editor has perceived that it must be so, that the period appeals to a different element in the student, young or old, that, while it is still possible to be entertaining, the emphasis must now be laid on political affairs and especially on the development of American institutions of government. More space might well have been given to the development of American economic life, considering its vital importance in a new country; but the growth of political institutions is certainly illustrated in a most varied and interesting manner. The skill with which this has been accomplished strikes the reader as perhaps the great success of the volume. The machinery of English control and the theories of Englishmen and provincials respecting it, the powers and duties of governors, the character and conduct of colonial assemblies and judicial courts, the typical forms of local government in the various colonies, are all illustrated by extracts capitally chosen and arranged. This division of the book is preceded by one in which the leading events and phases in the public history of the individual colonies are exemplified by lively writings,—*e. g.*, Salem witchcraft by portions of the testimony offered against the witches, the early days of Pennsylvania by Gabriel Thomas's account, the administrations of Andros and Nicholson in Virginia by Beverley's narrative thereof, and the founding of Georgia by half-a-dozen effective extracts. It is followed by a section devoted to the exhibiting of various aspects of colonial life, social, economic, intellectual and religious. In due proportion, more might have been made of the religious chapter. It seems a little meagre, and does not adequately exhibit normal conditions. Yet one would not have the ensuing chapter curtailed, in which a model series of excerpts illustrates slavery and servitude in the colonies. It is worth while to list them: the minute of the Germantown Quakers (1688), Sewall's *Selling of Joseph*, the text of the disallowance of a slave act (though here an act hindering importations, and its disallowance, would have been better), a series of advertisements of runaways, an extract from Woolman's *Journal*, Eddis on white servants, and Washington on importing Palatines. Part V. is concerned with intercolonial wars, Part VI. deals, very abundantly, with the causes of the Revolution, Part VII. with the characteristics of the patriot and loyalist parties and of the British and American forces. The various political, diplomatic and military aspects of the Revolution are illustrated with great skill, though we should think there might have been a few more good accounts of battles. Also, for the general period, we should think more space should have been given to the West.

Space for such purposes might have been saved from the "Practical Introduction." It is excellent and most helpful, but it is a repetition, with only the illustrations changed, of the introduction to the first volume. Apparently it is thought that there will be a considerable separate use of the individual volumes (there are to be four). We do not think so. Most courses in American history, given either in school or in college, are continuous courses in the whole history of the United States; and not many will employ these useful and vivifying volumes for one period without wishing to use them for all.

Two small criticisms of detail may be added. First, the head-notes to the extracts might often be made a few words longer, to the profit of the student. He will often need a little more explanation. Thus, most of No. 79 refers to Braintree, though it appears to relate to Boston. If a letter is given, it should be stated to whom it is addressed. Secondly, it is a pity to print "y^{e}" for "the," if only because it will lead American youth to perpetuate the unfortunate habit of most of their elders, in pronouncing the word so printed as if it were the plural of "you," and supposing that our ancestors used to print it so.

The Writings of James Monroe, including a Collection of his Public and Private Papers and Correspondence now for the first time printed. Edited by STANISLAUS MURRAY HAMILTON. Vol. I., 1778–1794. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1898. Pp. lxxv, 400.)

DOWN to the time when, at the age of forty-five, Monroe went to Paris to negotiate for New Orleans, he kept no letter-books and preserved copies of but few of his letters. The Monroe Papers in the possession of the Department of State include but a score of his letters anterior to 1800, and these are mostly of the period of his first mission to France. The present volume, a welcome addition to the handsome series of the "Writings of the Fathers," extends only to his departure upon that earlier mission. Accordingly the editor, an accomplished and painstaking official of the Bureau of Rolls and Library, has drawn from the Monroe Papers but two of the letters in the volume, and one of those, the long and important letter of August 12, 1786, to Patrick Henry, was presented to the Department by Mr. William Wirt Henry and has been printed in his life of his grandfather (II. 291). Mr. Hamilton has drawn his material almost wholly from the rich stores of the Jefferson and Madison Papers, also possessed by the Department. Out of 131 letters printed, 73 are letters to Jefferson (all but one of them from this source), and 47 are letters to Madison derived from the government's Madison Papers. Only ten, perhaps only nine, are derived from other sources than the manuscripts of the Department, and of these at least six have already been printed,[1] though the fact is not mentioned in any case save one.

Mr. Hamilton has placed historical scholars under obligations of such magnitude by his volume, and has, moreover, for so many years obliged with unfailing helpfulness all those who have had occasion to use the treasures from which the volume is drawn, that it seems ungracious to pause at this point and find fault. Yet two criticisms are inevitable, and fortunately they are of such a sort that they can without serious difficulty be met in the subsequent volumes of the series. In the first place, the source whence each letter is derived ought without fail to be indicated. This should surely be regarded as a fundamental rule in all editing of correspondence. If the letter has been printed before, the reader is entitled to know it. In the second place, a larger range of sources should be drawn upon. It is quite true that, down to 1803 at any rate, Monroe's letters to Jefferson and Madison are of much more consequence than any others. An industrious and sensible public functionary, neither brilliant nor original, he was their pupil (especially Jefferson's), leaned on them, sought their advice, and kept in constant touch with them.

---

[1] To Charles Lee, June 15, 1780, *Lee Papers*, III. 427; to Washington, August 15, 1782, *Correspondence of the Revolution*, III. 527; to R. H. Lee, December 16, 1783, May 24, 1786, Lee's *Lee*, II. 221, 224; to Governor Harrison, October 30, 1784, *William and Mary College Quarterly*; to Washington, April 8, 1794, Sparks, X. 557.

His letters to them from Congress, during the years 1784, 1785 and 1786, are on the whole the most valuable part of the collection. But there are not a few other existing letters, which have a considerable interest. Mr. Hamilton does not exclude from his scheme letters that have already been printed, and this is wholly proper, since so few of Monroe's letters have found their way into print. Now the letter of September 10, 1782, to Lord Stirling, printed in Duer's *Stirling*, p. 250; that of April 4, 1783, to Richard Henry Lee, printed in Lee's *R. H. Lee*, II. 225; that of February, 1784, to George Mason, in Miss Rowland's *Mason*, II. 68; that of April 20, 1786, to Jay, in Jay's *Correspondence*, III. 190; those of December, 1790, from Senator Monroe to the Governor of Virginia, in the *Virginia Calendars*, V. 229, 231, 414; and that of April 7, 1792, to Henry Lee, printed in the appendix to the latter's *Campaign of 1781*, p. xlvii, are all of interest, not to say of greater interest than some of the letters to Jefferson and to Madison. Of these last Mr. Hamilton has omitted almost none. He prints all but three or four of those possessed by the Department, a practice to which we should think he could hardly adhere in later volumes.

Of manuscript letters, too, there must be more in existence. The catalogue of the McGuire sale mentions twenty-eight, some of which fall within the period before 1794. The George Clinton papers at Albany contain many Monroe letters. The archives of the state of Virginia formerly contained a number of Monroe's letters from the Continental Congress to the governor of the state, one of which, at least, dealing partly with the Vermont controversy (1784), was of much interest and value. If the others have been lost, there is a copy of this among the Sparks Papers. In particular, it would have been gratifying if more letters of 1787 and 1788 could have been got together, from the treasures of autograph-hunters or otherwise.

But the volume as it stands is a most valuable possession, and a signal addition to our means of understanding the times to which it relates. It will be a long time before scholars will have exhausted all that can be derived from it. The editor has done his own work with conscientious care. The notes, which are not numerous, are well executed. The cipher passages in the letters ought all to have been deciphered. There is a table of contents, of the same clear and satisfying construction which has been used in the earlier issues of the series. A very well-conceived addition is that of "Annals of the Life of Monroe," which extend to some fifty pages, embracing not only biographical annals, but the substance, and often the text, of motions made by Monroe in deliberative bodies and of reports made by committees of which he was a member.

We cannot close without adverting to the light which the full publication of Monroe's letters of the years 1784–1788, to Jefferson and Madison, casts upon George Bancroft's literary methods. He makes use of nearly two-thirds of those letters in the appendixes to his *Formation and Adoption of the Constitution*, printing parts or, in a few cases, the whole letter. But they are almost always garbled. Garbled in the original sense of the word, to be sure, not in its modern and worse sense. There is no evidence of intention to deceive; but the text presented is a mosaic of sentences or passages picked out and run together, with no indication of omission. The result is sometimes misleading. For instance, Mr. Bancroft's process gives us, in one letter (I. 363) the following: "For four or five days past the qualification of the delegates from Rhode Island hath been the only subject before us. The question was, Shall a delegation retain its seat, or any particular member, the term of service having actually expired? The gentlemen wait for me." What Monroe really wrote was this (Hamilton, I. 27): "For four or 5 days past the qualification of the Delegates from R. I. hath been the only subject before us. The motion respecting them was from Mr. Read. This brought forward the report of the committee, which was against them and conformable to the principles established in the case of Delanson. Upon the question shall the resolution stand? 4 States voted in the affirmative, 2 in the negative and 3 were divided. Of course it was enter'd in the journals that it was lost. The question then was, are they under this vote delegates? On the side of those in the negative the arguments are: if 7 states were on the floor represented generally by but two members and the question was, shall a delegation retain its seat, or any particular member, the time of service having actually expir'd, the vote of one member only would keep him in Congress. 2. that," etc. This is quite a little different. Judging from internal evidence only, it is plain that Mr. Bancroft's text is in other respects considerably less correct than that of Mr. Hamilton (though "giving our own citizens a show," p. 87, is surely too modern; Mr. Bancroft has "share").

The later volumes, dealing with transactions in which Monroe was more nearly the central figure, will be awaited with impatience. Some of them will lead us down into a field which sorely needs more abundant illustration. For the years after 1815 we have, to be sure, a good number of letters of Adams, Jefferson and Madison; but they had now become spectators of the drama. We shall not see with clearness the faces and motions of the actors till we have editions of the correspondence of Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Calhoun, Jackson, Van Buren, Clinton, Tompkins, Crawford (if it be possible), and fuller sets of Clay and Webster. Mr. Hamilton has broken ground most acceptably in a great field.

The Federalist: A Commentary on the Constitution of the United States, by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay. Edited, with notes, illustrative documents, and a copious index by PAUL LEICESTER FORD. (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1898. Pp. lxxvii, 793.)

IN the preparation of this volume, Mr. Ford has had in view two distinct objects, a convenient working edition of *The Federalist* and a manual for the study of the history of the constitution of the United States. These objects are sufficiently dissimilar to render their combination difficult, and the results, in the present instance, are of unequal value. The main part of the work, *The Federalist*, is, in several respects, a marked advance on all preceding editions. The rest of the volume is taken up with a very perfunctory collection of constitutional documents relating to the history of the United States since 1789. These twenty-five documents are simply arranged in chronological order without any critical apparatus whatever. It is probable that Mr. Ford's book was already in the press when Professor MacDonald's collection was published. Before the appearance of the latter, Mr. Ford's collection, imperfectly prepared as it is for purposes of systematic instruction, would have been welcome. Now, one can but lament that he did not devote the space to reprinting in a more accessible form selections from his *Essays* and *Pamphlets on the Constitution.* By so doing Scott has given his edition of *The Federalist,* in other respects less desirable than Lodge's, Dawson's, or Hamilton's, and far inferior to Mr. Ford's, a distinct value. For the new index every student of *The Federalist* must be grateful. It is hardly too much to say that it alone will make this edition indispensable. The running titles, the marginal cross-references to parallel passages, and the new table of contents will also be very helpful.

Mr. Ford's commentary is always interesting and will prove stimulating and instructive to students of our government as it is. I regret to say that, judged by a reasonable standard of historical accuracy, it is in need of careful revision. Freeman once said: "The accurate man is not a man who makes no mistakes, but a man who corrects his own mistakes in the proof-sheets." This Mr. Ford has not taken sufficient pains to do. He writes from the exceptionally large stores of his knowledge of American history with the easy confidence of a brilliant talker who is a master of his subject. Some of the errors in the notes arise from haste, others seem unaccountable on any ground except off-hand reliance upon a memory more fallible than its owner suspects, while still others are perhaps more justly characterized as paradoxes or vagaries of judgment. If Mr. Ford had taken the scholarly precaution to give the reader some precise references for the historical matter in the notes he must needs have discovered some of these errors himself. A few examples will illustrate these points. On p. 458 is this note: "According to Mr. Bryce, the last instance 'of the use of the veto power in England was by Queen Anne in 1707 on a Scotch mill bill.' In Tod's *Parliamentary Government in the English Colonies* (ii. p. 319) the author says that in 1858 changes in a private railway bill were compelled by an intimation to its promoters that, if these changes were not made, the royal power of rejection would be exercised." For "mill" read "militia," and for Tod, read Todd. This last misprint as well as the whole sentence is taken bodily from Bryce. It is, however, entirely irrelevant, as it relates to a crown veto of colonial legislation. P. 425, "In Bagehot's *English Constitution* he discusses at some length the question of the time at which the House of Lords 'must yield' to the Commons, and reaches the singularly stultifying conclusion to his main argument that it is 'whenever the opinion of the Commons is also the opinion of the nation.' " As no hint is given of what Bagehot's main argument was, nine readers out of ten will surely conclude that Mr. Ford regards Bagehot's dictum, as quoted, as absurd, whereas it is to-day the established conservative view of the position of the Lords. Lord Salisbury has justified the existence of the Lords on the ground that they can save the country from radical revolutionary legislation till it becomes certain by a general election that the will of the country is known, when it is their duty to yield. On p. 329 Mr. Ford writes: "The early Congresses of the Union assumed the right to nominate the President, and for thirty years forced upon the people candidates for President." Who could get from this note any correct notion of the nomination by party caucus? P. 211: "During the Civil War most of the northern states incurred 'war debts,' that of New York alone being in excess of twenty-seven million dollars. But this latter was so greatly out of proportion to the debts of the other states that recently the larger part was refunded by the national government." To what does this refer? I can but conjecture that Mr. Ford had in mind the refunding of the direct tax of 1861. If I am wrong, the stricture still holds good that such a note should be more explicit or should refer the reader to a source of further information. On p. 142 in discussing deadlocks between the houses of Congress, he says that they have "compelled the introduction of a new legislative element in the shape of a third or union chamber, usually termed a compromise committee." The proper term is "committee of conference," although the more familiar name is simply "conference committee." I should be glad for a reference for this statement on p. 70, "Warm as the national feeling has been toward France, we aided St. Domingo to obtain its freedom by every possible if surreptitious device." Our feeling was not warm toward France, except in irritation, during most of the disturbances in St. Domingo; yet, when this irritation was keen during the power of the Directory, Secretary Pickering was careful to prevent the government from being implicated in any violation of neutrality. (Cf. *Am. Hist. Assoc. Rep.*, 1896, pp. 825–827.) On the next page (71) Cornelius de Pauw's fanciful "*Recherches Philosophiques sur les Américains*" are credited to Raynal.

On p. 520 we read that "Jefferson, with more extreme action, holding the alien and sedition acts to be unconstitutional, actually refused to consider them as laws." This refers to action by Jefferson as president, but it is perfectly well known to everybody that these acts expired by limitation before Jefferson became president. Later on in the same note we read "Jackson is quoted as saying that he intended to support the constitution as he 'understood it.' " Why not quote Jackson himself rather than some unnamed source? In his Bank veto message Jackson wrote: "Each public officer who takes an oath to support the constitution, swears that he will support it as he understands it, and not as it is understood by others." In the review of the history of attempted nullifications on p. 101 there is no mention of the Personal Liberty laws which are among the best examples; on the other hand mistaken importance is assigned to the fact that in California during the war greenbacks did not circulate. This was not nullification in any sense. Mr. Ford attributes the failure of the greenback to circulate in California to the force of public opinion. Add to this the fact that California was a remote and detached community and a large producer of gold. Nullification is the attempt of the constituted authorities of a state to abolish within its boundaries a federal law on the ground that it is unconstitutional. For over half a century after the establishment of our coinage system nearly all the silver coin in actual circulation was Spanish or Mexican. That fact, however, is not to be mentioned in a history of nullification. The following comment on p. xxv is incomprehensible: "The only serious endeavor to break up the country which has ever occurred was in a section where those who should have been the controlling citizens were chiefly slaves, unable to make their influence a power." As one reads the notes it soon appears that inheritance and income taxes are a genuine bug-a-boo to Mr. Ford. His dogmatic deliverances on these intricate questions give no evidence of any impartial study of these matters. To him they are simply devices to shift the burdens of government unfairly on to a minority.

In his general comments on political tendencies Mr. Ford is often very suggestive. Take, for example, his brief supplement to Mr. Bryce's chapter, "Why the best men do not go into politics." In substance, it is that the increase in the facilities of communication between constituents and representatives has made the representative far less independent in action and far less important than was formerly the case. He is gradually but inevitably being depressed into a mere delegate. This condition is repellent to men of masterful character and pre-eminent ability.

There is much that is interesting and highly instructive in the first part of the Introduction, which takes up the political conditions following the Revolution. In regard to the discussion of the authorship of the disputed numbers it is not necessary for me to take up more than one or two points, for Mr. Ford has reprinted without change the article which he contributed to the REVIEW in July, 1897. It would be futile to repeat the criticisms that I then offered, for they made no impression on Mr. Ford. It will not be presumptuous to say that some of his assertions were proved absolutely to be mistaken and that the basis of others was seriously undermined. Yet he makes no corrections or defence. This is, of course, discouraging to a critic, and misleading to the public. It cannot fail to impair one's confidence in Mr. Ford's readiness to weigh evidence contrary to his previous conclusions.

He still ascribes Numbers 18, 19 and 20 to Hamilton and Madison, although his notes make it clear that Madison wrote them. He is still positive that the document commonly called Hamilton's "Brief of Argument on the Constitution" is a syllabus of *The Federalist* drawn up by Hamilton for Madison's guidance in continuing the papers when Hamilton stopped with Number 36, published January 8, 1788. Against this assumption, I showed "that some of the heads of this syllabus reproduce the topics of some of Hamilton's earlier numbers" (*e. g.*, 9, 22, 23). He would hardly expect Madison to go over that ground again, while it would be natural enough to use it again himself in the New York convention. In addition to this I will now call attention to the fact that this syllabus reproduces in skeleton form an argument elaborated in one of the earliest Madison papers, No. 14, published November 30. Toward the end of the syllabus we find these apparently meaningless figures under the caption

"Exaggerated ideas of extent:"

"N.	45	42	
S.	31	31	
	14	11	438
	973	764½	mean 868¾ by
			750"

What could Madison make out of that memorandum unaided? Turning, however, to Number 14, p. 84, the significance is clear. The whole number is devoted to confuting Montesquieu's notion that republican government was suited only to small territories. One of several arguments urged against its application to the Union is that the Union is not really so large after all. "The limits as fixed by the treaty of peace, are: on the east, the Atlantic, on the south the latitude of 31 degrees, on the west the Mississippi, and on the north an irregular line, running in some instances beyond the 45th degree, in others, falling as low as the 42d. Computing the distance between the 31st and 45th degrees, it amounts to 973 common miles; computing it from 31 to 42 degrees, to 764½ miles. Taking the mean of the distance, the amount 868¾. The mean distance from the Atlantic to the Mississippi does not probably exceed 750 miles," etc. The same argument and additional points that I have omitted will also be found in the memorandum which Madison drew up for use in the Virginia convention. The natural and unbiassed conclusion is that this statistical argument was originally drawn up by Madison and that it was so effectively used by him in Number 14 that Hamilton in preparing himself for the New York convention jotted down a brief memorandum of the figures for the dimensions of the country. This was perfectly legitimate. It is by no means necessary to prove or to assume that every argument in *The Federalist* originated with Hamilton. There are no difficulties in believing that this document is what John C. Hamilton and Lodge called it, "Brief of Argument," etc. There are insuperable difficulties in believing it to be what Mr. Ford says it was: a syllabus drawn up by Hamilton in January, 1788, to guide Madison in expounding the details of a government that Hamilton did not believe in and of which Madison, more than anyone else, was the framer.

EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE.

The Proposed Amendments of the Constitution of the United States during the First Century of its History. By HERMAN V. AMES, Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania. [Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the year 1896, Vol. II.] (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1897 [1898]. Pp. 442.)

THIS essay won the prize awarded by the American Historical Association for the best monograph based upon original investigation in history, submitted to the Council in 1896. It is a work of great value and interest to all students of American history, and no investigator into the development of our Constitution or the growth of our political institutions can afford to overlook it. The production of the monograph proves the wisdom of the Association in offering the prize, which we hope will result in a series of similar researches, even if they do not reach the excellence of this essay by Professor Ames. Scholars of constitutional history have long felt indebted to Professor Albert Bushnell Hart for the investigations into the journals and documents of Congress pursued in his seminary at Harvard. And this, the author of which gracefully acknowledges the aid of Professor Hart, is of the same character although superior to the rest.

The book begins with a brief historical summary of the amendments proposed. They are then described in detail, classified in accordance with their respective subjects, accompanied by an account of the circumstances which suggested them. This, the principal part of the essay, displays wide learning as well as microscopic research, and is a magazine of curious facts, many of which are little known, that will be invaluable to any future historian. The conclusion is a chronological list of all the officially proposed amendments that Professor Ames has found, some of which were not published in the Journals but have been copied by him from the archives of the Senate and of the state legislatures. The catalogue contains more than 1740 propositions, from which have resulted the fifteen that have been adopted. The inaction of the lower house of the legislature of South Carolina in 1811 alone prevented the ratification of a sixteenth amendment, which would have been the thirteenth in consecutive order, providing that the acceptance of a title of nobility or honor should be a forfeiture of citizenship of the United States and a disqualification for office "under them or either of them." This passed Congress against but eight dissenting votes, was ratified by the legislatures of twelve states—in Pennsylvania unanimously,—and by the Senate of South Carolina; and the belief that it had become a part of the Constitution was so widely entertained that it was printed as adopted in official publications until 1817 and in school histories as late as 1836 (pp. 187–189).

The results from this and other searches in the Journals of Congress should lead to a new field for the investigators of the original sources of our constitutional and institutional history, who are now working in the universities. The journals of the state legislatures form an almost uncultivated province which will yield rich results to the patient explorer. His labors there will be rewarded not only by the discovery of the sources of many of the most important provisions of state constitutions that have been copied throughout the country and of statutes that have been copied throughout the world, the history of which is still unwritten; but also by unearthing precedents in conflicts between the three departments, the executive, the legislative and the judiciary, between the two houses of a legislature and between one house and a minority of its members, which will be of great value to statesmen in future crises of our national history.

If the prizes offered by the American Historical Association will encourage studies in this direction, all scholars whose vocations deprive them of the pleasure of such original research will be as grateful to these students as they are now to Professor Ames.

ROGER FOSTER.

The Journal of Jacob Fowler, narrating an Adventure from Arkansas through the Indian Territory, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, and New Mexico, to the Sources of Rio Grande del Norte, 1821–22. Edited with notes by ELLIOTT COUES. (New York: Francis P. Harper. 1898. Pp. xxiv, 183.)

"I LOVE ballads in print for then we know they are true." This knowledge of Mopsa's we all have in reading Fowler's *Journal*. We feel it to be as true as print or preaching. Lying is not easy when one writes to aid his own memory.

Jacob Fowler made a land journey of thirteen months from Covington, Ky., to Taos and back again. His narrative begins with his departure from Fort Smith, Ark., September 6, 1821. He was second in command in a horseback party of traders and trappers twenty strong. Their route was along a branch of the Arkansas reaching that river near the southern line of Kansas. They made the earliest recorded march up that stream to the site of the modern Pueblo. Thence five of the company crossed the mountains to Santa Fe. Their absence was alarmingly long, but after four weeks they returned with permission to trap and trade in the Spanish provinces. Accordingly they followed the Taos trail, and arrived in Taos after ten days of mountain march. Thence five of them pushed on up the Rio Grande not only to the site of Pike's block-house where he was captured by Spaniards, but within one day's travel of the reported head of that river. The return homeward was partly down the Arkansas, and then over to the Missouri near Kansas City.

The memoranda jotted down from day to day by Major Fowler relate to a world in much of which he was the earliest explorer. They ought to have been published long ago. His experience as a land-surveyor doubled the value of his observations. Streams, their beds and water, water-powers, springs, trees, lime, coal, hills, prairies, animals, nothing escaped him. Multitudes in Kansas and Colorado will greet his book with a double welcome. Thanks to the illuminating topography of Dr.

Coues they will recognize the earliest mention of characteristic features in their local habitations. Fowler's cabin on the spot where Pueblo stands was the first house built there. After leaving the shadow of his starting-point he discovered no house during the five months' pilgrimage to Taos. His band carried no provisions except salt. Beans and corn were bought of some squaws, but most of the game had been scared away by Indians who would daily kill a hundred buffalo—eating little of them but the tongues. The Indians if hostile were robbers, and if friendly were worse, as thieves. Spaniards were more feared than natives. Neither proved worth trading with. Trapping was also a failure. Buffalo skins were too heavy in the pre-wheel era, while of beaver, the fur most coveted, the catch never equalled the days. One of the adventurers was killed by a bear. Horses were so often stolen that much of the day must be spent in securing them for the night, in pens four logs high with no entrance save through the door of the travellers' tent. They needed such a safeguard, even when near friendly Indians who had come home with two hundred newly-stolen horses. Their thievish skill was a match for Gines Passamont's stealing Sancho's mule while its owner was sleeping in the saddle.

Fowler's record is of laconic terseness, but it shows him as resourceful as Robinson Crusoe, and draws the reader along in wonder what will come next. His idioms cannot be forgotten. The cañon was "bound in on each side with a rock a squirrel could not climb." "No more rain than would wet a man's shirt. Wind so cold we scarce dared to look around." "Nothing to eat. We look at each other with hungry faces. Whites grew black in the face, and Paul (a negro) was getting white with the same complaint."

Odd incidents are the green hide of a buffalo used as a boat, and Spaniards painted like Indians. But the oddest of all also showed an aboriginal sense of humor. Fowler having broken one of the glasses in his spectacles, an Indian ran off with them, and Fowler's cry "stop thief" was answered by a universal laugh from the tribe around. The thief had fitted the spectacles on an Indian who had but one eye. The shout was, one glass, one eye. Fowler's own surprise, however, was greatest at a boiling spring spouting up and forming a pond of hot water "where the ice extended some feet from the shore." He was amazed that "ice could exist on hot water, caught hold of the ice and was not only scalded with the water, but was burned with the ice it being nearly as hot. It was a mineral that had congealed."

Fowler might have become an Indian monarch. He played a good bluff game in word and deed against threatening foes. By ransoming a Spaniard from Indian captivity he made that nation friendly. Thanks to medals and other trinkets he stole the hearts of aboriginals so fully that they refused to sell him horses and stole those he brought with him in order to keep him among them. In the multitude of foes he found safety, for each tribe defended him from some other, and his Calibans were less treacherous than Prospero found his.

JAMES D. BUTLER.

The Monroe Doctrine. By W. F. REDDAWAY, B.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. (Cambridge: University Press. 1898. Pp. vii, 162.)

FROM the historical standpoint this is the most valuable contribution to the literature of the Monroe Doctrine which has yet appeared. With due deference to the philosophy of history the author states in the opening chapter, entitled "The Postulates of the Monroe Doctrine," the events beginning with the peace of 1763 after the termination of the Seven Years' War, which led to the Declaration of 1823, while most writers upon the subject treat the Declaration as a naked proposition with little reference to a cause. Mr. Reddaway is a scholar of keen discernment and thorough in investigation. He exhibits a knowledge of American history very creditable to a foreigner and he shows a discriminating judgment and great accuracy of analysis in the presentation of the instances in which the Doctrine has been applied or invoked.

The following passage from the preface is a succinct statement of the author's views: "Nothing newly published has seemed to the author to render necessary any modification of the main conclusions of the essay: —that the evolution of the Monroe Doctrine was gradual; that the peculiar form of the Message of 1823 was due to John Quincy Adams; that he, and he alone, logically applied it in politics; and that it produced its desired effect as an act of policy, but in no way modified the Law of Nations. The recent policy of the United States towards both Cuba and Hawaii appears to add strength to the argument of the last chapter—that since 1829 appeals to the Doctrine have been regulated by neither the nature nor the limits of the original."

By the student of American history the portrayal on pages 30–34 of the respective characteristics of President Monroe and John Quincy Adams, his Secretary of State, must be regarded not merely as a striking picture but as the very perfection of antithesis.

In the chapter which treats of the occupation of Mexico by the French during our Civil War are these words, particularly significant at the present time: "Every power, as a member of the international police, has the right to interfere in behalf of any nation which it may deem to be oppressed."

While it is to be regretted that by some oversight a table of contents is omitted, and while the book is perhaps too profound for the casual reader, it will doubtless be regarded as a classic by those who take more than a passing interest in the subject.

GEORGE FOX TUCKER.

The Liberty and Free Soil Parties in the Northwest. By THEODORE CLARKE SMITH, Ph.D. [Harvard Historical Series, VI.] (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1897. Pp. xi, 351.)

THE history of the Liberty and Free Soil parties of the Northwest by Theodore Clarke Smith is a timely and valuable contribution to our political annals. The title of the book might well have been "the genesis of the Republican party," for it sets forth clearly the causes which found their natural outcome in the grand movement that rallied under Fremont in 1856, and triumphed under Lincoln in 1860. The repeal of the Missouri Compromise played an important part in rousing the people and speeding the march of events, but it was merely an incident, as Mr. Smith shows, of the concerted measures which had already been set on foot for the formation of a consolidated national anti-slavery party that was to supersede all previous organizations. In the light of these facts, it seems surprising that the beginnings of anti-slavery politics in the Northwest have hitherto been unexplored. The work has probably been slighted as belonging to the field of local history; but the principle of hostility to slavery was not local. It touched the national life, as history testifies, and the men of the Northwest were helping to lay the foundations of a world-famous movement. What they did is worthy of historical record, and the record is now made.

The writing of such a history called for patient industry and tireless labor. It involved much travel through the Northwestern states; correspondence with anti-slavery pioneers and their descendants, and personal intercourse with them; the search for important facts in many public libraries; the thorough overhauling of the files of many old newspapers; and the orderly combination of the material thus gathered into an adequate and faithful account of an important historic movement. All this work is well done. Mr. Smith writes in sympathy with his subject. He seems, indeed, to have entered into the spirit of his task as if he had been himself a party to the strifes and struggles he describes; and yet his judicial temper is never found wanting He deals fairly and even kindly with the old parties. He frankly takes note of the mistakes and short-sightedness of the Free Soil leaders touching their coalitions with Whigs and Democrats; and he criticises both Liberty party men and Free Soilers for their faults of temper and harshness of speech in dealing with their opponents. But he recognizes their courage and zeal in standing by a great cause in the day of its weakness and in the face of insurmountable obstacles. "For a young voter," says Mr. Smith, "or a young aspirant for political honors to cast in his lot with the third party was at almost any time and in almost every state an act of heroic self-abnegation. As we read of committees and nominations, and tickets and campaigns, we forget that nearly all of these meetings and urgent appeals were the laughing-stock of both the regular organizations; that the Liberty leaders, and nearly all of the Free Soil leaders, were cut off from any hope of election to any office in the gift of the people. Mistakes and miscalculations and intemperance of language were effaced by the magnificent purpose to arouse the nation to a consciousness of its own guilt and danger from slavery." The history of such a party is a fascination. We read it in the illumination of great historic facts which owe their lineage to the courage, constancy and self-forgetfulness of men who made themselves of no reputation in the service of the truth. Through a series of years and in spite of overwhelming numbers and the greatest discouragements they prosecuted their purpose "with a step as steady as time." They were confronted by personal abuse, political proscription, and sometimes by mob violence; but they resolutely maintained their ground. Slowly, and little by little, they saw their cause advancing, never doubting its final triumph; and, at last, when the madness of slavery struck down the Missouri Compromise and flooded the country with anti-slavery recruits, they willingly disbanded the little parties in which they had so long labored, and joyfully took their places in the grand national movement which followed. All this is set forth in detail in Mr. Smith's chapters, and we hope they are to be followed by a like history of the Liberty and Free Soil parties of New England and the Middle States, and a final volume dealing with the formation of the national Republican party and its great work.

Mr. Smith confines himself exclusively to the question of political action against slavery. This is the novel feature of his work, but we think it adds to its timeliness and value. It touches a question about which there has been much controversy and some confusion of thought, and the truth ought to be told. That class of anti-slavery men who regarded the Federal Constitution as "a covenant with death," and whose consciences constrained them to abjure the use of the ballot, were obliged to do their work outside of politics. Their agitation was moral, and so far as it strengthened anti-slavery opinion it re-enforced the work of legislation; but anti-slavery opinion could not enforce itself. It needed some working theory giving assurance of results. The attempt to overthrow slavery without political action under a government carried on by the ballot was simply preposterous, while the dissolution of the Union would leave the slave in his chains. Nor could any citizen escape complicity with slavery by declining to vote. Total expatriation was necessary, and this was neither enjoined nor practised. We honor the great moral leaders whose unquestioned courage and devotion to humanity have done so much to efface their mistakes of judgment, and whose labors have been so abundantly recounted in our anti-slavery literature since the close of the Civil War; but the abolition of slavery was accomplished in spite of their theories, and by methods which they unsparingly condemned. History will so make the record, and we think the work so well begun by Mr. Smith may be accepted as an earnest of this consummation.

One of the most attractive features of this volume is its character-sketching. In the admirable account of the famous coalition in the Ohio legislature of 1848, by which the Free Soilers secured a United States senator, the reader will find better photographs of Salmon P. Chase and Joshua R. Giddings than he has ever seen before. Each of these famous men is made to stand forth in the lights and shadows of his character in his true attitude and real lineaments. A similar observation would apply, though in a less degree, to James G. Birney, as sketched in other parts of the volume. Mr. Smith's estimate of Samuel Lewis, of Ohio, is strikingly true, and it will gladden the heart of every surviving friend of this most unselfish and unsullied anti-slavery hero; while he makes honorable mention of many inconspicuous but faithful laborers in the great cause whose right to historic recognition is properly asserted. The great leaders are duly honored; but so are the minor celebrities who gave their whole hearts to the work in counties and townships, including many editors of local newspapers who spent their little fortunes in the effort to propagate their principles. Without the labors of these men the great cause would have made little headway, and they should be honored as brave and faithful pioneers who opened the way for the armies that were to follow.

We think Mr. Smith's general fairness in dealing with the Anti-Nebraska movement in his nineteenth chapter needs a little qualification in his reference to Indiana on pp. 290 and 291. His tone seems rather too apologetic. The movement of 1854 was captured by Know Nothings and Silver Gray Whigs who completely subordinated the slavery issue to their longing for immediate success. There was a strong and growing anti-slavery feeling among the masses, but it was smothered by the mercenaries who managed the campaign. It ended in an overwhelming victory in which nothing was decided. The same game was played the following year and with like results, while even in 1856 a similar "combination of weaknesses" insulted political decency. In the state "fusion" convention of this year the name Republican was for the third time disowned, and Fillmore Knownothingism was recognized in the formation of the state ticket and the selection of presidential electors. Clay, Burlingame and other distinguished leaders of the Republican cause were not allowed to take the stump in the country south of the National Road where such speeches were imperatively needed, and the new movement was frequently defended as the "white man's party." Such facts should not be slighted, because they belong to the history of the Anti-Nebraska struggle, and show how fearful must have been the task of anti-slavery regeneration in that state.

A few slight inaccuracies may be cited. On page 6, Rev. W. H. Brisbane is mentioned as a native of North Carolina. It should be South Carolina. On p. 61, S. C. Stevens is referred to as residing in Madison County. His residence was the town of Madison, in Jefferson County. On the same page, "E. Deming, a lawyer," should read "E. Deming, a physician." On p. 130, Mayor J. B. Seamans is mentioned as presiding over a state convention at Indianapolis in July, 1848. He was not mayor of Indianapolis, but a journalist residing in La Fayette. On p. 237, "G. F. Vinton" should be "S. F. Vinton." On p. 269, L. D. Campbell is referred to as a Free Soiler in 1848; he was a Whig. The volume is well printed, and attractively presented in other respects, while in the matter of style, its chief fault is the lack of smoothness. This fault, however was not easily avoided in a narrative abounding in so many particular facts and minute details.

GEORGE W. JULIAN.

History of California. By THEODORE H. HITTELL. Vols. III. and IV. (San Francisco: N. J. Stone and Co. 1897. Pp. 981, 858.)

THE earlier volumes of Mr. Theodore Hittell's *History of California* covered the period preceding the admission of the state into the Union. The present volumes conclude the entire work, extend their story as far as the death of Governor Bartlett, in 1887, and deal with the periods of the early mining life, the great Vigilance Committee, the political struggles before the war, and the industrial and political developments since the war.

The disposition of the extensive material is substantially as follows:—Book VIII. of the whole work, with which the third volume opens, discusses, in fourteen chapters, covering some 330 pages, the "Early Mining Life." In this book, Chapter I. gives a general account of the methods and conditions of the early stages of placer mining life; Chapters II. and III. give some of the annals of the "northern mines;" Chapter IV. is devoted in a similar way to the "southern mines;" and Chapter V. tells some of the stories of the early gold excitement, with their attendant "results." Hereupon, the chapters from the sixth to the ninth, inclusive, portray the social conditions and general "characteristics" of the early miners, at considerable length, the treatment being based upon those countless anecdotes, as well as more or less contemporaneous reports, which memory and travellers' and pioneers' narratives have preserved, in one form or another, until now. The development of miners' law, the struggle for organization, the varieties of Lynch law, and, finally, the first large Vigilance Committee of San Francisco, in 1851, occupy Chapters X. to XIV., and conclude Book VIII.

Book IX. is devoted to the "Progress of San Francisco." After four chapters on the very rapid development that occurred between 1850 and 1854, Chapters V. and VI. of this book discuss the commercial calamities of 1854–55; and Chapter VII. begins the often-told tale of the Vigilance Committee of 1856. The story of the great committee then continues through Chapter XIV., to the close of the Book (p. 649 of the volume).

Book X. deals with a more miscellaneous collection of topics, under the head of "State Growth." The United States Land Commission of 1851 for the settlement of the titles of Mexican origin, the early squatters, the various "anti-foreigner" movements; the filibusters (especially the famous Nicaragua filibuster Walker); the early visits to Humboldt Bay and to Yosemite; the early stages of agriculture; and the Indian wars (including events as late as the Modoc war of 1873), here together fill fourteen chapters, extending to page 981, and so closing the volume.

The fourth and final volume of the whole work contains Books XI. and XII., and is devoted to the political history of the state. This volume begins once more with the admission of California into the Union, and with the administration of the first governor, Peter Burnett. The titles of the chapters of both books of this volume are usually furnished by the names of the successive governors; but an exception is made in the case of the famous politician and senator Broderick, who was killed by Terry in the noted duel in 1859, and in the case of the Pacific Railroads and of the new constitution of 1879. These topics receive treatment in chapters with special titles.

Of the two volumes here in question, the third is of most interest to the general student of American history, although there are also various episodes in the fourth volume which have a decidedly general national interest. For example, the career of Broderick and his famous rivalry with Gwin are, from any point of view, notable incidents of the period of ante-bellum politics; the forces that kept California in the Union during the war must interest every student of the fortunes of the Republic at that time; the completion of the first Pacific Railroad, and the rather unexpected social and economic sequel of that enterprise, are matters of national importance; and the story of the struggles that led to the new constitution of 1879, including the annals of the "Sand Lots," must form a part of the complete history of our more recent social processes in this country. Mr. Hittell's work has no very dangerous rival as an extensive and careful portrayal of just these matters, so far as he has found material accessible. The early history of the province of California has been more extensively, and on the whole somewhat better told in the volumes prepared under the general direction of Mr. H. H. Bancroft than in Mr. Hittell's first two volumes of his California history. But for the period since the admission of California, the Pacific Coast histories of Mr. Bancroft's well-known series are much more unequal in character and far less scholarly than the earlier volumes; and any one who wants to be clear as to the basis upon which statements bearing upon California matters since 1850 are to rest, will, in this portion of the field, hereafter consult Mr. Hittell, until the whole material has received some new presentation. And Mr. Hittell's advantage rather grows the later down his chapters come in the story.

Meanwhile the general student will easily find Mr. Hittell's treatment too diffuse, his style colorless, and open to a good many literary objections, and his method not precisely the ideal one for a local history. For the method is one that runs to seemingly endless detail, and that uses too few summaries, and too few general points of view. But the defects do not prevent these volumes from being, for their purpose, a really admirable product of labor and devotion. They are often rough-hewn and uneven. Trivial facts or reports stand side by side with serious matters. There is a frequent lack of perspective. But Mr. Hittell makes the most studious efforts to be impartial, to avoid hero-worship, to subordinate his obvious and intense local patriotism to a purely objective concern for the truth, to keep clear of all unnecessary controversy, to be thorough-going, and even (what is hardest of all for the local historian) to be just to the relative importance of the various branches of his complex subject. It is in this last respect that, as just pointed out, he is especially open to criticism, but his efforts, at least, are constant and obvious. The general disposition of the materials, as just sketched, will seem at first sight, no doubt, to any student unacquainted with California, unnecessarily awkward. For why, one may say, should Volume IV. begin afresh with the admission of the state, when Volume III. has brought the story of social conditions and of Indian wars down to such comparatively recent dates? Yet, as a fact, the disposition in question is in its general outlines only too natural, in view of a certain rather unhappy divorce between the social and the political life of the state—a divorce which long characterized just this community. The miner and the politician, the Vigilance Committee man and the governor of the state, the filibuster, the squatter and the warrior with Indians,—all these are products of California whose fortunes and whose interests were for a long time far too independent of one another. The awkwardness of the story is in so far really due to the essential awkwardness and waywardness of the life portrayed. Government and society long lived, as it were, in two connected, but far too independent worlds.

As for a very few details, that may serve to guide a reader's interest in these volumes:—The sketch of the social conditions of the early mining-camp life is still rather disappointingly at the mercy of mere anecdotes. The actual factors and forces at work are rather imperfectly analyzed. After all that has been written upon the topic, one regrets to find the material so little reduced to a definitely classified and orderly form, and still so much left in the region of mere gossip. The land troubles are dealt with in a judicial spirit, and upon some matters, such as the pueblo claims at San Francisco, Mr. Hittell preserves his independence of judgment in despite of the decision of the courts. The very extensive and minute narrative of the great Vigilance Committee of 1856 takes account of all the latest materials, and maintains the traditional Californian view of the affair with great coolness and skill, and even with more fairness of tone towards some of the opponents of the Committee than one sometimes finds. As for the relation of California to the breaking-out of the Civil War, one is indeed again disappointed to find that Mr. Hittell, after all his opportunities to collect material, has so little that is new to say, although what he says is indeed obvious and sensible enough so far as it goes. There must surely be material in existence, in regard to this crisis in California, which would repay a careful monographic study. The account of the "Sand-Lot" and of the new constitution of 1879 is almost provokingly dispassionate, as well as almost wholly free from the sociological observations that would be, in these days, natural enough. In fact, Mr. Hittell's self-restraint as to all matters of generalization, here as elsewhere, seems to go too far; for he shows a practised judgment whenever he chooses to express himself in more general fashion; and his few summaries, where they occur, are always welcome.

Extensive sections of these volumes will have only a local interest; but the state of California, in any shape, deserves the careful attention of the student of American history. These volumes close with a copious index to the whole work.

Josiah Royce.

The Secession and Reconstruction of Tennessee. By JAMES WALTER FERTIG, A.M. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1898. Pp. 108.)

THIS brief monograph, which is Mr. Fertig's doctor's dissertation, undoubtedly possesses permanent value. It contains a straightforward and instructive account of the success of secession in Tennessee, of Johnson's military government and of the Brownlow régime up to the time when Tennessee was re-admitted to statehood. It also traces the thread of congressional debate upon the status of the seceded states and shows how the presidential plan of reconstruction was purposely and effectually thwarted by joint resolution of Congress even in the case of Tennessee. The narrative is not overburdened with details; yet every important event and every significant fact, whether elaborately set forth or merely mentioned, seems to have been properly allowed for in the conclusions reached.

On only one point of importance must the author's statement be challenged. He is mistaken in believing that a "military government" like that of Johnson "was at that time a term unknown to the history and laws both of the state and of the nation." A precedent is found in the last war before the Civil War, in the military government of New Mexico and Upper California both before and after the conclusion of peace with Mexico. It is sufficient here to call attention to two U. S. Supreme Court cases: Cross *v.* Harrison, 16 Howard 164 (1853), and Leitensdorfer *v.* Webb, 20 Howard 176 (1857), wherein the documents and authorities are cited. Varied and interesting are the duties which the military government is called upon to perform in behalf of civil and even of political rights before it is possible to substitute legally established civil government in place of the conquering military power.

The study is quite as interesting from the political as from the constitutional standpoint. Andrew Johnson was conscientious and loyal, but uncompromising even unto vindictiveness. So was Brownlow, and neither was a wise statesman. Mr. Fertig's narrative mades it clear that the oaths which Governor Johnson required of voters in addition to those prescribed by the President irritated the people, outraged the conservatives, aroused the radicals, disclosed their strength, gave them the advantage, led to the reorganization of a radical state government, made feasible the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment and so led to the favorable action of Congress. Tennessee escaped congressional reconstruction and carpet-bag government by dint of falling into the hands of the radicals, from whom she escaped by a *coup de main* in 1870.

In addition to official publications the author has used files of Nashville papers covering the whole period. Files of other state papers are rare if they exist at all. A file of Brownlow's tri-weekly *Whig*, Knoxville, for at least the first five months of 1861, can be found in the library of Yale University. Typographically the publication is not creditable to the press which issued it.

FREDERICK W. MOORE.

The Life of David Dudley Field. By HENRY M. FIELD. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1898. Pp. 361.)

THIS is a pious work by the Reverend Doctor Field in commemoration of his eldest brother. It seems designed rather as a memorial for the family than as a book for general reading. And its examination from that viewpoint affords a justification for what otherwise might be considered the disproportionate space awarded to the merits of the subject's ancestors, and others of his kindred, which includes even an account of the success of one of his descendants at a school examination. It is written in a kindly spirit and contains not a word which can give pain to any of his enemies. In the dedication to his brother, Mr. Justice Field, the author modestly apologizes for the fact that the task had been assigned to himself, a layman, who cannot fill in the "professional details." Yet a careful search has disclosed but one erroneous statement of the law, which is at pages 202 and 203, where Doctor Field says of the McCardle case, in which the constitutionality of one of the Reconstruction acts was argued before the Supreme Court: "Congress itself hastened to repeal the act in which it had assumed an authority which it did not possess." That statute was not repealed; but before the decision, on account of an intimation that it might be held unconstitutional, the act giving the court jurisdiction of the appeal was repealed and McCardle pardoned (*Ex parte* McCardle, 7 Wall. 506). But although the book is in spirit and execution praiseworthy if not blameless, it fails to give any adequate idea of the life and character of its protagonist or even of the reforms which he accomplished. A record of the latter, however, has been preserved for posterity in the three volumes of the *Speeches and Papers of David Dudley Field*, published before he died. Of the former it is perhaps too soon to attempt an accurate description.

In stature as well as intellect looking down upon the rest, he was for many years the most conspicuous figure at the New York bar. At an age when most of his contemporaries were dead and the rest too feeble to work, he continued till he was over eighty actively engaged in practice, advising conduct and drafting papers in transactions involving millions of dollars, and arguing the most important cases of the day. His extensive study of the history of pleading and practice, a field which from its dryness is usually neglected by the lawyer, made him unrivalled in fertility of resource; equally acute in defense to harass and delay his adversary by technical objections to the form of procedure and the nature of the relief asked, and ready when for the plaintiff to demand and obtain summary justice by the use of some new remedy invented for the occasion but supported by analogies from obsolete writs of which the opposing counsel and the judge had never previously read or heard. This power, combined with a profound knowledge of human nature, the weaknesses of which he understood, and a devotion to the interests of his clients which ignored fear or hope of favor from other sources, made him the greatest master of the strategy of litigation that the world has ever seen. In lucidity, simplicity, and precision of style as a draughtsman of pleadings, instruments, and statutes he was also without a peer. In the accomplishments which attract attention to an advocate in court, he was not so pre-eminent. In the art of cross-examination, he made no such reputation as that of O'Connor, Bangs, Fullerton and Choate. The graces of oratory, also, he did not possess, although he tried to cultivate them. He could not expand and reiterate an argument with varied illustrations. His perorations were often awkward if not turgid. He dominated and at times bullied, but rarely if ever conciliated the bench. It was by logic, clearness of statement and personal force that he won his greatest victories in argument.

The reputation of the lawyer, however, is ephemeral; and had his life been confined to the practice at the bar he would soon have been forgotten. David Dudley Field was spurred by an ambition to acquire something greater than wealth or professional pre-eminence, both of which he easily attained. He wished to leave not only his clients but the world his debtor, and for that he devoted his learning and technical training to the removal of the obstructions to the administration of justice which for centuries had always delayed and too often defeated suitors in England as well as the United States. Alone and unaided he undertook the task. His hand and brain pointed out the way, argued the practicability and expedience of fusing law and equity together, and drew the statutes by which that fusion was accomplished. The work was colossal and its opponents numerous, able and bitter. They comprised almost the entire bar of his own state, who found fault with his phraseology, denied the possibility of what he attempted, and compared "Jack Code" with Jack Cade. But his untiring energy persuaded the people of his own state to outvote the lawyers. And the success of the experiment in New York procured its imitation, with the approval of the bar, in almost every system of jurisprudence founded upon the common law throughout the world. In his later years, he dwelt with just pride upon the fact that he found at the Antipodes, in British China, India, Australia and Ceylon as well as in England, Canada, and more than twenty-seven states of his own country, judges daily enforcing statutes containing language written by him at Stockbridge forty years before.

For this posterity will not forget him. Greater than Bentham, he accomplished and himself framed the principal measures of reform which he preached upon the housetops. Unlike that of Napoleon and Justinian, his work was performed in the face of the most stubborn resistance and practically alone. And so long as Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence is administered his name will be held in grateful remembrance.

ROGER FOSTER.

Cases on American Constitutional Law. Edited by CARL EVANS BOYD, Ph.D. (Chicago: Callaghan and Co. 1898. Pp. xi, 678.)

THIS is a short collection of cases for the use of college and law-school classes. It is based upon the larger and valuable collection edited by Professor James Bradley Thayer of the Harvard Law School. It contains but two cases not in its model; and should be used only by students who are too poor to buy Thayer's *Cases*. It is confined to decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States; and the omission of head-notes, which seems to be considered necessary in books prepared for use in the case system of instruction, makes it useless to the practitioner.

The work of the editor and publisher seems to be well done. The type, paper and binding are excellent, although the failure to cite volumes and pages in the table of cases is an irritating blemish. The Income Tax cases and the Debs case are included in the collection. And the notes, so far as they go, are accurate and fit for their object, the instruction of the beginner.

The modesty of the preface disarms the critic. The size of the volume affords an adequate excuse for the exclusion of many cases, which we should expect to find there. There are, however, a few omissions which we think will make the book tend to mislead the student. The editor should have added a note referring to the later cases which have limited the effect of the Dartmouth College case (4 Wheaton 518). The Original Package cases (Peirce *v.* The State of New Hampshire, 5 Howard 504, and Leisy *v.* Hardin, 135 U. S. 100) should also be accompanied by a note showing that they have been obviated, so far as the sale of intoxicating liquor is concerned, by an Act of Congress (August 8, 1890, 26 St. at L. 313) which was held by a divided court to be constitutional, *In re* Rahrer (140 U. S. 545). A reference should also have been made to the first South Carolina Liquor cases, Scott *v.* Donald (165 U. S. 58), Same *v.* Same (165 U. S. 107). We presume that the last South Carolina Liquor cases, Vance *v.* W. A. Vandercook Co. (170 U. S. 438) and the last Oleomargarine cases, Schollenberger *v.* Pennsylvania (171 U. S. 1) and Collins *v.* New Hampshire (171 U. S. 30), were reported after Doctor Boyd's book was in press.

Doctor Boyd appends to his report of the Slaughter House Cases (16 Wall. 36), a note containing only a quotation from a statement by Mr. Justice Miller, in 1887, fourteen years after the decision, saying that "no attempt to override or disregard this elementary decision of the effect of the three new constitutional amendments upon the relation of the state governments to the Federal government has been made." The editor should have added to this the information for the student that the principles laid down in this opinion have now been overruled. The Supreme Court has held repeatedly that the protection of the Fourteenth Amendment covers the white as well as the colored races and forbids discrimination upon other grounds than race, color or previous condition of servitude (*e. g.*, Gulf, Colorado and Santa Fe Railway Co. *v.* Ellis, 165 U. S. 180). And the late case of Allgeyer *v.* Louisiana (165 U. S. 578) holds squarely that the Fourteenth Amendment gives to the Supreme Court of the United States the power to hold void all state legislation, which in its opinion unreasonably restricts the right to pursue a lawful calling. This decision and that which upheld the Utah Ten

Hour Law (Holden *v.* Hardy, 169 U. S. 366) should have been at least cited in this collection.

ROGER FOSTER.

Mr. Samuel N. Norton, of Rio Vista, California, sends us a handy little pamphlet entitled *Days and Dates*, which presents ingenious and, so far as we have tested them, accurate tables for finding the day of the week on which any date from A. D. 1000 to A. D. 2282 fell or will fall, by Old Style or by New Style. Useful as the tables will no doubt be to persons who have no more extensive handbook of chronology, the letterpress which accompanies them is not impeccable. It is an error to say that all Catholic nations at once adopted "New Style" upon its installation by Pope Gregory, October 4, 1582. It is a similar error to say that in September 1752 all Protestant nations, following England's example, adopted that style. The author speaks of the enactments of Romulus and Numa with respect to the calendar as well-established matters of fact. The pamphlet closes with a concordance of the French Revolutionary calendar with the Gregorian; it is one day out for the years IV. and VIII.

Mr. Joseph H. Crooker's little book on *The Growth of Christianity* (Chicago, Western Unitarian Sunday-school Society, pp. 241) is the result of a modest and earnest attempt to give a purely rational account of Christian history, chiefly for the use of Sunday-schools. For such purposes it is perhaps too fluid and abstract, assuming or leaving at one side the solid structure of concrete facts which Sunday-school pupils so much need, and taking rather the form of a comment on Christian history already known. The comment is conceived distinctly from the point of view of Unitarianism, and is, as might be expected, enthusiastic for liberty and optimistic with respect to human nature. While its denominational tone is seldom narrow, no slight distortion of view in respect to the relative importance of different portions of church history might easily be produced by the disproportionate space which the book gives to the Trinitarian controversies in early times, and those relating to Arminianism and religious freedom in later years. Some portions of the author's prodigious field have to be slighted in consequence. Yet the book is in many ways unusually good among manuals so brief.

The authors ("H. M. and M. A. R. T.") of a *Handbook to Christian and Ecclesiastical Rome* (London, Adam and Charles Black) have planned "to give the visitor to Rome full information about the Christian side of its history, about Roman churches, ceremonies and customs, which does not fall within the scope" of Murray's and other guidebooks. Their first volume, now published, a volume of 547 pages, of a mechanical execution well adapted to its purpose, is devoted to The Christian Monuments of Rome. The subject of the second will be The Liturgy in Rome. The third will deal with Monasticism in Rome and with Ecclesiastical Rome in other senses. The present volume is largely historical in character. It contains a very large amount of fresh and useful information on churches and catacombs in general, and on each church and catacomb in particular, and many a traveller who can make a long stay in Rome will be benefited by its use. In the way of criticism it must be said that, in those sections which are general in their nature, the authors have not always followed systematically a logical arrangement. There is a good deal of skipping back and forth, and more or less discourse, always interesting to be sure, on points which more properly belong in the second volume.

It is fortunate for the general public that the best scholarship of England is willing to devote itself to filling up the innumerable historical "series" which are now running. Hassall's *Louis XIV.*, Poole's *Wycliffe*, Hutton's *Philip Augustus*, and Tout's *Edward I.*, each in a different series, have now a worthy companion in Hodgkin's *Charles the Great* in the "Foreign Statesmen" series. The author has already set his own standard for this sort of work in his *Theodoric the Goth*, and the present book is an even better specimen of the best kind of popular writing. One feels a little tendency to resent what seems like a waste of already meagre space when he finds one-third the book occupied with a history of the earlier Carolingians, but the work is really a marvel of disguised condensation and one cannot fail to be astonished at the ease and skill with which so much of the history of the times is told in 250 pages. The narrative follows the sources very closely with copious translations, and many passages which are not between quotation marks are hardly more than translations from Einhard or the chroniclers, and, of course, one finds little to criticize in Hodgkin, unless he makes much of some difference of opinion. It seems to have been pretty clearly proved, however, that Adelgisel and Ansegisel were two different persons, and that Martin was the paternal uncle of Pippin of Heristal; in describing Charles Martel's use of the church lands it is plainly implied that this included only the appointment of his friends to church offices, omitting entirely the far more important *precaria verbo regis;* and in saying that feudalism does not go back into Merovingian days, while the statement is in terms accurate, it is so made as to convey a wrong impression regarding the origin of feudal institutions.

The first two *fasciculi* of Vol. XVII. of the *Analecta Bollandiana* (Brussels, Société des Bollandistes, 1898, pp. 264, 48) is mainly occupied with the presentation and discussion of the hagiographical materials derived from three related collections,—the martyrology of Wolfhard of Hasern, the collection which (because its chief manuscripts sprang from five Austrian monasteries) is called the Magnum Legendarium Austriacum, and the Legendarium of Windberg. The mutual relations of these Legendaries are examined with studious care. Then follow a considerable number of the contributions to hagiology which are contained in them.

Of these perhaps the most interesting are lives of two Irish bishops, Mochuille and Ronan. The former has no direct value for Irish history; the latter is to be discussed in the forthcoming November volume of the *Acta Sanctorum*. M. Ulysse Chevalier's *Repertorium Hymnologicum*, which has hitherto been published in supplements to the *Analecta*, having now been completed, the present *fasciculus* offers the first part of a catalogue of the Greek hagiographical manuscripts of the Vatican.

The Ancestry of John Whitney, by Henry Melville, A.M. (New York, De Vinne Press, pp. xviii, 295.) One may well believe that the author of this book spent "four years of investigation," and a great deal of money besides, in preparing and publishing it. It is quite the handsomest and most interesting book of the kind we have met. It appears, moreover, to have been worth doing—whether upon so sumptuous a scale is another question. To many it must be a book worth having—an edition of six hundred has been printed; but who can stand the charge?

Perhaps we ought not to speak of "books of the kind." The truth is, there are few books like this one. It is more than a book of genealogy, though there is much genealogy in it; it is less than a book of history or of biography, though there is much history and biography in it. So far as it is a work of genealogy, it travels far afield as compared with American works of that name. The whole field is different; it begins indeed where American genealogy delights to begin, if only it can—with an ancestor firmly fixed and located in England; but thence it runs upstream instead of down, to the sources. As a book of history, which sensibly enough it does not pretend to be, it could only pass as a scrappy piece of second-hand work.

The book is a sort of historic-genealogy, as nearly as words can hit it; giving an account of the English Whitneys, of Whitney on the picturesque Wye in Herefordshire, from the first appearance of the family in known records to the last. The two extremes are the thirteenth and the seventeenth centuries. The story is a striking instance of the mutation of familiar names; once familiar in England, Whitney now is scarcely known except as an American and Canadian name. The last Sir Thomas died without issue about two years before the death of the emigrant John, his second cousin and nearest male relative. "There are probably as many of the name to-day," says the author, "in some Massachusetts village as can be found in all England."

A sturdy, aggressive race, the Whitneys, seated in the Marches of Herefordshire, over against the Welshman, from the first played a part, at times conspicuous enough, for good or ill, to satisfy the family pride of their descendants to-day. What part they played from century to century is told in this book, in chapters severally entitled, "The Whitneys of the Thirteenth Century," "of the Fourteenth Century," "of the Fifteenth Century" and "of the Sixteenth Century," with a preliminary chapter on "The Origin and Early History of the Whitney Family" and a final chapter on "The Last of the Whitneys of Whitney."

The chapters are not merely founded upon records, they are largely made up of them. Indeed, the book is a collection of materials for a history of the English Whitneys, with connecting narrative. The records are given with sufficient fulness, mostly in translation; the connecting narrative is told not without good sense and taste. The book abounds with excellent illustrations of places in the valley of the Wye, and there is a large "Map of the Whitney Estate with its Surroundings" as it appeared in 1895. Fac-similes of documents also abound. Genealogical appendices and an index, no better than it should be, close a volume, bound in vellum covers held together by stout ties and stamped with the Whitney arms.

MELVILLE M. BIGELOW.

Mr. Julian S. Corbett, of whose *Drake and the Tudor Navy* we expect to take more especial notice later, has edited for the Navy Records Society a volume of *Papers relating to the Navy during the Spanish War, 1585–1587* (London, The Society, pp. l, 363) which illustrates in a very interesting manner the period of war, or rather of general reprisals on the high seas, which preceded the year of the Armada. The documents come mostly from the "State Papers, Domestic," at the Public Record Office, though some of the most important are derived from the Lansdowne and other collections at the British Museum. They are arranged in three divisions. The first contains narratives, despatches and letters of intelligence, etc., which relate to Drake's "Indies voyage" of 1585–1586, and prove that this was not, as has perhaps generally been thought, a haphazard raid, but "a thoroughly well conceived, if ambitious, design to destroy the sources of Spanish transatlantic commerce and ruin her colonial empire." The second collection of papers relates to the Cadiz voyage of 1587. The documents here printed make clearer than ever before the high strategical importance of Drake's seizure of Cape St. Vincent, which is shown to be, not a mere incident, insignificant and inexplicable save as an act of bravado, but an intentional achievement having results at least as important as those which flowed from the fight in Cadiz harbor or the capture of the *San Felipe*. The greater number of these papers, however, relate to the quarrel between Drake and the vice-admiral, Borough. Part III. consists of papers bearing on questions of admiralty administration, especially Hawkins's administration and the attacks made upon him, and on matters of naval ordnance. The subject of guns and gunnery in the Tudor navy is treated with great learning and clearness in an appendix. The introduction is a model of lucid exposition, and the notes are all that one could desire or expect, even from Mr. Corbett.

Dr. Guernsey Jones, of the University of Nebraska, in his Heidelberg dissertation entitled *The Diplomatic Relations between Cromwell and Charles X. Gustavus of Sweden* (Lincoln, Neb., State Journal Co., pp. 89), has printed an admirable monograph on an interesting subject.

The relations of Cromwell with Sweden after the abdication of Christina had an important connection with the project of a general Protestant alliance which stood so near his heart and at times so strongly influenced his policy. The negotiations between the Protector and the Swedish king were hampered, and at length made abortive, by a radical difference of objects. Charles Gustavus was less concerned to fight against Catholicism than to assure to himself the control of the Baltic by making war on Denmark and opposing the Dutch, while England's commercial interests, of which Cromwell was ever mindful, as well as his political and religious projects, impelled him to promote peace and equilibrium among the naval and commercial powers of the Baltic. Dr. Jones has followed out the story of the working-out of these cross-purposes with great care and good judgment, using apparently all the printed matter, English, Dutch, Swedish and German, that was accessible in London, and much manuscript material at the British Museum, the Bodleian, and the Public Record Office. He has not examined the despatches of the Swedish ambassadors in London, though we should suppose that they would be highly important and that copies of them could readily be obtained from Stockholm; but Pufendorf and other writers have given him summaries of some of them. His style cannot be praised.

The Life of Judge Jeffreys. By H. B. Irving, M.A. Oxon. (New York, Longmans, pp. 380.) This work does not contain one uninteresting page. Every lawyer who has a taste for the literature of his profession should place it on his shelves by the side of Campbell's *Lives*. And all who enjoy history should read it. The style, with the exception of a few cheap similes, is temperate and attractive. The type and paper are pleasing to the eye; and there is but one fault in the work of the publisher, a serious one in a biography, the failure to head the pages with the date of the text in the year of our Lord and that of the subject's age.

Like most biographers at the end of this century, Mr. Irving tries to extenuate the faults of his hero. The omission to cite at the foot of each page the authorities for his assertions makes it often hard to decide as to the soundness of his defense. But he clearly scores a few points against the Whigs, and sufficiently establishes the inaccuracy of some of the rhetorical flourishes of Campbell and the reckless falsity of much of the narrative of Macaulay, who in at least one case has invented a speech which Jeffreys never uttered.

Although, however, this biographer has subdued the portraits made by his predecessors, has shown some of the provocations for the outrages perpetrated by the judge, and has suggested the reasons which may have seemed to the actor justifications for them, the result has been merely to make the judicial monster more human, not to change any of the characteristics which had been heretofore attributed to him. This book makes it easier to believe that he existed, but it does not relieve the horror which an account of his acts must always inspire in the mind of any healthy man. Insolent in success, cowardly to the point of grovelling when rebuffed; servile to the great, bullying the low; callous to all human suffering except his own, to which he was most tender; coarse and vulgar on the bench, deciding cases in conformity with the will of those who had the power to gratify his ambition; always a judicial tyrant, and at times a judicial murderer, posterity has continued for him the hate which he received from his contemporaries; and justly, to the end of time, when men wish to describe a tyrannical and wicked judge, they will say that a Jeffreys has come to judgment.

ROGER FOSTER.

Dr. George C. Williamson, who in 1895 published a life of John Russell and in 1896 one of Richard Cosway, has written for "The Connoisseur Series" a book entitled *Portrait Miniatures* (London, George Bell and Sons, pp. 170), designed as a handbook for collectors who do not buy Dr. Propert's elaborate and expensive *History of Miniature Art*. The chapter on the early English miniaturists, that on Hilliard, Oliver and Cooper, and those dealing with most of the artists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, are based on that book; those on painters in enamel and on foreign miniaturists on other standard books. More original are the chapters on Cosway and the two Plimers, those on modern work and the most notable collections of the present time, and those which give advice, marked by much good sense and moderation, on collecting and on the bibliography of the subject. The volume is illustrated by nearly two hundred excellent reproductions of miniatures or enamels, either in collotype or in process, showing many of the finest examples of the art, and enabling its history to be followed with considerable satisfaction.

Skalpieren in Nordamerika. Von Premierleutnant Geo. Friederici, (Sonder-Abdruck aus Band LXXIII., Nr. 13. u. 14. des *Globus*, Braunschweig, 1898). This brochure by Lieutenant Friederici contains a mass of historical and ethnologic information upon the subject discussed. The references are necessarily more historical than ethnologic, for the reason that superficial observation of Indian customs began with the discovery of America, while the intelligent investigation of their meaning dates back only a few years.

The author finds indications of the practice of scalping among the ancient Germans, Gauls, Jews and Scythians, the Malays and African negroes, as well as among the Indians of both Americas. In America it was most general among the tribes north of Mexico, and was observed in Canada as early as 1535.

Students of American history are well aware that the custom of scalping was not only encouraged, but systematically practised by the rival French and English colonists, but the mass of testimony which the author has collected is something astonishing. For over a hundred years human scalps, of Indian, French or English, men, women or children, were a marketable commodity with value fixed by legislation, being usually quoted higher in Boston than in Quebec. In one noted instance even a minister of the gospel engaged in the business at the rate of one hundred pounds per scalp. As late as 1863 the territory of Idaho authorized "for every scalp of a buck $100, for every woman $50, and for everything in the shape of an Indian under ten years $25."

The scalp yell, the scalp dance, and the method of preparing the scalp are described, but the author says little concerning the importance attached to scalps in connection with religious mysteries. This branch of the subject remains still to be investigated. The idea that the Indian believed that scalping prevented his entrance into the Indian heaven is probably only a popular error.

JAMES MOONEY.

Miss Edith Sichel's *The Household of the Lafayettes* (London, Constable and Co.; New York, Macmillan, 1897, pp. 348), is extremely interesting; one could read it through at one sitting, had one time. Of course the character of the subject goes a good way, but the intrinsic interest in this precise subject, it is one of Miss Sichel's merits to have discerned. Heretofore the career of Lafayette had not appeared to me as a subject for romance, either in fiction or in good glowing facts. But Miss Sichel regards the Noailles and Lafayettes as representatives of the best, but least appreciated element of the old nobility and presents this matter as well as she does the amorphisms of the Revolution; she gives us account of the horrors of the Revolutionary prisons in Paris as well as of the lot of Lafayette when himself exile and captive; she has the opportunity to describe the Christian idealism of Mme. Lafayette, as well as the zeal for liberty of her husband. A good subject then, as well as a very well written book. It goes without saying that in a book which implies a *résumé* of the history of the most important half-century of modern times will be constant occurrence of ideas and opinions, as to events and men, with which many will heartily disagree. But such a book as this is to be read by those who have already some knowledge, and such will not be likely to be led far astray. If we are to push criticism to rigor I think I must say that the book on the whole impresses me as being more picturesque than intellectual, that it does not give us the theories of Lafayette as definitely as it does Lafayette the theorist, that although we feel that all this must have been much as it is here set down, we are not quite sure how it was that it all came to be. Lafayette—possibly not a difficult character—seems rather too near the hero of an old-fashioned novel. Dryasdust in his fever for facts often suspects the lighter touch. Still one reads a book like this not to borrow ideas ready-made but to stimulate one's own thinking, and for this purpose it is amply and excellently sufficient.

EDWARD E. HALE, JR.

Dr. Lauros G. McConachie, in his *Congressional Committees* (New York, T. Y. Crowell and Co., no date, pp. 441) has a subject which has long demanded thorough and scholarly examination. Such an investigation he has evidently bestowed. It is impossible not to admire the extent of his reading in the voluminous sources, and the fulness of his knowledge. Not less admirable is the author's insight into the conditions of congressional life in the past and in recent times. He has great skill in observation of the developments of parliamentary procedure and in reflection upon them. It is a pity, therefore, that he has such unfortunate methods of presentation. His style is distressingly turgid; for example, his last sentence reads thus (he is speaking of the United States Senate): "Across its narrow way we still peer back into the regions whence we have come,—see the morning of the world, the marches of the Teuton forests, Hellenic tribal bounds, snowy-haired patriarchs of Orient, the solitary cave-dweller gazing out over Britain's untamed seas." Very likely we do; the present reviewer would be slow to affirm that we do not; but is this the style in which to write of the history of parliamentary procedure? The fault is not simply one of taste; the constant excess of rhetoric, the inability to say a plain thing in plain language, makes it frequently difficult to get the author's meaning. Yet surely few topics more strenuously demand simplicity and directness than the history of legislative methods. It is a pity the author could not have caught the terse precision of Hatsell or the limpid clearness of Jefferson. Moreover, the arrangement of the book lacks order and method to a really surprising degree. Many students will resort to the book, inevitably; the information they seek will often be in it; but they will often have great difficulty in knowing where to find it, or into what words of plain English to translate it when found. The chapter on committees before 1789 is noticeably imperfect.

In his little book called *Seven Months a Prisoner* (Scribner, pp. 258) Mr. J. V. Hadley tells an interesting, at times even thrilling, tale of military adventure during the Civil War. It is a pleasing and apparently veracious addition to the number of such narratives, told in a straightforward manner, and with an old-time flavor of that "unreconstructed" feeling toward Secession and all its works which we so readily excuse in old prisoners.

Dr. Thomas W. Bicknell has, with exemplary devotion, explored the annals of his native town, and produced a creditable *History of Barrington, Rhode Island* (Providence, the author, pp. 616). The book is much larger and more important than his *Sketches of Barrington* (1870). Dr. Bicknell cannot resist the temptation to begin his narrative of Barrington with the visit of the Northmen, nor is he always critical in his treatment of times considerably later. His identification of "Sowams," the home of Massasoit, with Barrington rather than with Warren, will raise some clamor, yet has much good argument in its favor. The history of the settlement in its successive relations as part of the colonies of Plymouth, Massachusetts Bay and Rhode Island is traced with minute care and much intelligence. The later portions of the book, beside the usual chapters as to war records, devote more attention than is common to the economic and social history of the town. Many biographies are given.

The fourteenth volume of the *Collections* of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin (pp. 553) opens with a history of Mackinac by the editor, Mr. R. G. Thwaites, corresponding secretary of the society, and an account of early days on the island, by Mrs. Elizabeth Thérèse Baird. Most of the other articles are contributions to one of the three divisions of Wisconsin history to which the articles in recent volumes of the *Collections* have mostly been devoted, the history of military posts in Wisconsin, the history of the early missions within its borders, and the history of the various bodies of foreign population settled therein. Military history is chiefly represented in this volume by careful histories of Fort Winnebago and of Lincoln's participation in the Black Hawk War; missionary history by documents relating to the history of the Episcopal and Catholic missions at Green Bay and Little Chute, and by an account of Father Samuel Mazzuchelli. The foreign groups dealt with are the Cornishmen, the Icelanders and the Germans, whose local origins in Germany are carefully traced.

In Vol. VIII., Part 3, of the *Collections* of the Minnesota Historical Society (pp. 271–542), the most important contributions to history are General Richard W. Johnson's history of Fort Snelling from its foundation to the present time, and Lieutenant David L. Kingsbury's account of Sully's expedition against the Sioux in 1864. There is also an article on the history of mining and quarrying in the territory and state, by the secretary of the society, Mr. Warren Upham. The rest of the volume is mostly taken up with reminiscences of early pioneers, often interesting, but somewhat formless.

NOTES AND NEWS

Alphonse Wauters, perhaps the most eminent of Belgian historians, died in Brussels on May 2, at the age of eighty-one. His publications, almost all of which bore directly on Belgian history, were very numerous. The most important were: *Histoire de la Ville de Bruxelles*, by him and A. Henne (1843–1845); *Géographie et Histoire des Communes Belges* (1869–1873); *Les Libertés Communales en Belgique* (1869–1878); and the first nine volumes of the *Table Chronologique des Chartes et Diplômes imprimés concernant l'Histoire de la Belgique* (1866–1896).

Dr. Karl Knies, professor of political science in the University of Heidelberg, died in that city on August 3, at the age of seventy-seven. He was one of the most prominent representatives of the historical school among German economists. His most famous work, *Die Politische Oekonomie vom Standpunkte der geschichtlichen Methode*, appeared in 1853. In 1892, after a long series of economic works, he published for the Historical Commission of Baden, *Der briefliche Verkehr Carl Friedrichs von Baden mit Mirabeau und Du Pont.*

Dr. Georg Moritz Ebers, the Egyptologist, died near Munich on August 8, at the age of sixty-one. Though best known by his historical novels, the scene of which was laid in Egypt, he was professor of Egyptology at Leipzig from 1870 to 1893, and had acquired scientific repute by various erudite publications, the most extensive of which was an edition of the important papyrus which he discovered in Egypt in his journey of 1872–1873 and which was called by his name.

Hon. Thomas M. Cooley, formerly chief-justice of Michigan and at a later time head of the Inter-state Commerce Commission, died on September 10, at the age of seventy-four. He was chiefly noted as a jurist and as a writer on constitutional law, but in 1885 published a volume on the history of Michigan in the "American Commonwealths" series.

Mr. William Kelby, formerly librarian of the New York Historical Society, and for many years officially connected with that organization, died in Brooklyn on July 27.

Professor W. J. Ashley of Harvard University will be absent in Europe during the coming academic year. Dr. William Cunningham of Trinity College, Cambridge, will lecture in his stead.

Miss Lucy M. Salmon, professor of history in Vassar College, will spend the coming academic year in study in Europe. Mr. Theodore Clarke Smith will act as her substitute.

Mr. Allen Johnson has been elected professor of history in Iowa College, in the place of Professor Leonard F. Parker, resigned.

At the meeting of the International Congress of Diplomatic History which was held at the Hague during the past month, on the occasion of the enthronement of Queen Wilhelmina, there was distributed to the members a "*Projet provisoire de Statuts*" providing for similar international historical congresses to recur in the future, at intervals of two years, the next to be held at Paris in 1900. The scheme contemplates sessions similar to those of other international congresses of savants, arranged for by a committee of the country in which the meetings are held, and under the honorary presidency of its minister of foreign affairs or of education; an organization into sections for ancient, medieval, modern and recent history respectively, with sub-divisions; and even the election of "vingt hautes personnalités de la science" as a permanent, self-perpetuating "Académie Internationale de l'Histoire." Details will be discussed at Paris in 1900.

Upon the model of Iwan von Müller's *Handbuch der klassischen Wissenschaften*, a co-operative historical work of great extent entitled *Handbuch der mittelalterlichen und neueren Geschichte* is being prepared in Germany, under Drs. Georg von Below and Freidrich Meinecke as editors. It is to be published by R. Oldenbourg in Munich, and is to consist of five chief divisions; general, the auxiliary sciences, constitutional-legal-economic, political history, and antiquities, each to consist of several treatises.

Beginning in January 1899 the firm of Hettler, of Leipzig, will publish, under the title *Bibliotheca Historica*, a monthly repertory of references to historical articles in current journals.

The announcements now made for the "Foreign Statesmen Series" include volumes on: Louis XI., by Professor G. W. Prothero; Ferdinand of Aragon, by E. Armstrong; Mazarin, by Arthur Hassall; Louis XIV., by H. O. Wakeman; Catharine II., by J. Bury; and Cavour, by the Countess Cesaresco.

ANCIENT HISTORY.

At the beginning of the year 1899 the house of B. G. Teubner, of Leipzig, will begin the publication of an *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete*, edited by Dr. Ulrich Wilken, of Breslau, with assistant editors in various countries. The object of the new journal is the publication of articles relating to or derived from the material contained in the thousands of papyri discovered in recent times, or concerning the history of Hellenism in Egypt; texts also, occasionally, and news interesting to those engaged in this special branch of inquiry.

The Oxford University Press is about to issue for the Egypt Exploration Fund the first volume of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, edited by Messrs. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. The volume will contain 158 texts, a few of which are literary, while a majority are official and private documents, dating from the first to the seventh century of our era.

Professor Ettore Pais of the University of Pisa has published another instalment of his extensive scheme of a general history of ancient Italy. His project comprises two divisions, each of three volumes: a history of Sicily and Magna Graecia, of which the first volume was published in 1894, and a *Storia di Roma*, both to be carried down through the Punic wars, to the time when Italy was unified under Roman rule. Of the second section he has now published Vol. I., Part I., *Critica della Tradizione sino alla Caduta del Decemvirato* (Turin, Carlo Clausen, pp. 629).

Dr. William Fairley's edition of the Monumentum Ancyranum, in the series of *Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History*, published by the University of Pennsylvania, presents the Latin and Greek texts, an English translation, an excellent introduction, and a bibliography. It should do much toward making this fundamental text more widely known among our students.

Mr. Furneaux's edition of the *Agricola* of Tacitus (Oxford, Clarendon Press) is edited with so unusual a degree of attention to the historical, archaeological and topographical problems connected with that treatise as to demand notice of the book in a historical journal.

Professor Dill of Queen's College, Belfast, is completing a work on *Social Life during the last Century of the Roman Empire of the West*, which is to be published before long by Messrs. Macmillan. The volume will deal with such topics as the force and manifestations of pagan sentiment; the moral tone of Roman society; the fiscal administration; the decay of the middle class; the expectations as to the future of the Empire; the relations of Romans with barbarians; and the condi tion of literary culture and education in the fifth centnry.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Maspero, *Anciens Testaments Égyptiens* (Nouvelle Revue Historique de Droit, 1898, 3); *The Babylonian Discoveries* (Edinburgh Review, April); E. W. Hopkins, *Ancient and Modern Hindu Gilds*, II. (Yale Review, August); G. W. Botsford, *The Trial of the Alcmáeonidae and the Cleisthenean Constitutional Reforms* (Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, VIII.); U. Köhler, *Die Eroberung Asiens durch Alexander den Grossen und der korinthische Bund* (Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie, 1898, 6 and 7); B. W. Henderson, *The Campaign of the Metaurus*, I. (English Historical Review, July); E. Beaudouin, *Les grands Domaines dans l'Empire Romain*, V. (Nouvelle Revue Historique de Droit, 1898, 3); G. Magliari, *Il Patriziato Romano dal secolo IV. al VIII.* (Studi e Documenti di Storia e Diritto, XVIII. 3–4).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY.

Dr. Cheetham, archdeacon of Rochester, is writing a history of the church from the Reformation to our own times, conceived upon the model of his own *History of the Early Church*, and of the late Archdeacon Hardwick's books on the church history of the Middle Ages and of the period of the Reformation. The four volumes will thus form a series chronologically complete. Dr. Cheetham's book will be published by Messrs. Macmillan.

The Rev. S. Baring-Gould's new edition of his *Lives of the Saints* (London, J. C. Nimmo), has now been completed by the addition of the sixteenth volume, containing valuable indexes to the whole series.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. F. Hassett, *Primitive Episcopal Elections*, II. (Catholic University Bulletin, July); L. Traube, *Die Regula Sancti Benedicti; Geschichte des Textes* (Abhandlungen der K. Bayerischen Akademie, hist. Cl., XXI. 3); A. Ehrhard, *Symeon Metaphrastes und die griechische Hagiographie* (Römische Quartalschrift, XI.).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

M. Paul Sabatier, the biographer of St. Francis of Assisi, has undertaken the publication of a collection of documents for the religious and literary history of the Middle Ages. The first volume makes a valuable beginning by putting forth an edition of the *Speculum Perfectionis seu Sancti Francisci Assisiensis Legenda Antiquissima auctore fratre Leone.*

Father Conrad Eubel has published (Rome, the Vatican press, pp. xlii, 643) the fifth volume of his official *Bullarium Franciscanum, sive Romanorum Pontificum Constitutiones, Epistolae, Diplomata tribus ordinibus . . . concessa.* It covers the years of Benedict XI., Clement V. and John XXII. For the former two pontificates, we are told, the work was not of great difficulty, most of the documents being already in print; but the reign of John XXII. required the examination of sixty thousand documents in the papal archives.

Messrs. Chapman and Hall have in hand a volume entitled *Medical Works of the Fourteenth Century*, transcribed from four manuscripts of that period, edited by Professor Henslow, with introduction and notes by Professor W. W. Skeat.

Mr. M. Macauliffe, formerly of the Indian civil service, sends out a circular letter, originally addressed to the Sikhs, relating to the translation into English of their sacred book, the Granth Sahib, the laborious task upon which he has been for several years engaged, lately under special commission from the Khalsa Diwan. The work is of much importance, not only to the history of a most interesting religion, but incidentally also to portions of the medieval history of India. Mr. Macauliffe's circular is accompanied by a specimen translation of the Japji of Guru Nanak, the morning hymn of the Sikhs, submitted for suggestions. His address is 2. Cantonments, Amritsar, India.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Seeliger, *Volksrecht und Königsrecht* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, 1898, 3); E. Bernheim, *Das Verhältnis der Vita Caroli Magni zu den sogen. Annales Einhardi* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, 1898, 2); K. Zeumer, *Zur Geschichte der Reichssteuern im früheren Mittelalter* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXI. 1); C. Neumann, *Die byzantinische Marine, ihre Verfassung und ihr Verfall* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXI. 1); R. Holtzmann, *Die Wahl Friedrichs I. zum deutschen König* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, 1898, 2); P. Fournier, *Deux Controverses sur les Origines du Décret de Gratien* (Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuse, III. 2, 3).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

The recent record publications of the British government include Vol. II. (1313–1317) of the *Patent Rolls of Edward II.;* Vol. IV. (1338–1340) of the *Patent Rolls of Edward III.;* Vol. I. (1547–1563) of the *Calendars of State Papers relating to Scotland and Mary Queen of Scots,* edited by Joseph Bain; Vol. XVII. (1588–1589) of the *Acts of the Privy Council,* edited by Mr. John R. Dasent; a new volume (1690–1691) of the *Calendars of State Papers, Domestic,* of the reign of William and Mary, edited by William J. Hardy; and a list, compiled from documents in the Public Record Office, of the sheriffs of England and Wales from the earliest times to 1831.

In the *Revue des Questions Historiques* for July, M. Alfred Spont reviews recent English historical publications, including a few of those of the United States. M. Charles Bémont has a survey of the recent official archive-publications of the United Kingdom in the September number of the *Revue Historique.*

The Publishing Section of the American Library Association proposes to issue a series of catalogue cards for new books in English history, with annotations prepared by Mr. W. Dawson Johnston indicating briefly the character, scope, sources and value of the books, and referring to important reviews of them. An edition in pamphlet form will also be issued. The address of the Section is 10½ Beacon Street, Boston.

Hon. John W. Fortescue, of the Public Record Office, is writing a *History of the British Army,* of which the first volume will probably be published by Messrs. Macmillan before the end of the present year.

The Society of Gray's Inn intends preparing for publication a portion of its records.

In view of the approaching millennial commemoration of King Alfred, the Clarendon Press intends to publish a new edition of Asser's life of the king, by Mr. W. H. Stevenson.

Mr. H. Thurston has published (Burns and Oates, pp. 680) a *Life of St. Hugh of Lincoln,* translated from the French Carthusian life, and edited with large additions from other sources.

Mr. A. F. Leach has recently completed for the Surtees Society a volume on *Beverley Minster,* the text of which will be a transcript of the act-book or minute-book of the chapter of Beverley, chiefly relating to the years from 1304 to 1325. Mr. Leach's contributions as editor will include much information respecting the minster and its grammar school.

Major-General the Hon. George Wrottesley is publishing, in a strictly limited edition, *Crecy and Calais, from the Public Records*, based upon his discovery, among the Memoranda Rolls of the Exchequer, of writs proving the names of those who accompanied Edward III. on his brilliant expedition, many of whom are still represented in the male line among the English gentry. General Wrottesley, who is himself descended from one of the original Knights of the Garter, Sir Hugh Wrottesley, is issuing the work privately and giving illustrations, in colors and "metals," of all the banners borne by the English at Crecy. His volume, though not published, can be obtained from Messrs. Harrison, 59 Pall Mall, London.

Mr. J. Hamilton Wylie is understood to be working upon a history of the reign of Henry V., to follow his four volumes on Henry IV., of which the last is reviewed in our present issue.

Canon J. T. Fowler, D.C.L., F.S.A., is preparing for publication for the Surtees Society an edition of the *Rites of Durham*. The text, written in 1593 by some one who had known the abbey previous to its dissolution, will be illustrated by two volumes of extracts from the account rolls of the various officers of the abbey—the cellarers, hostillars, chamberlains, almoners, infirmarers, terrars, bursars, sacrists and feretrars.

Mr. Julian S. Corbett is writing a volume which, continuing his *Drake and the Tudor Navy*, will carry on English naval history to the death of Elizabeth.

The Art and Book Company are publishing a history of the Franciscans of England, 1600 to 1850, by Father Thaddeus, a member of the order.

Father Gerard has followed up his previous publications upon the Gunpowder Plot by issuing in a small *opus* called *Thomas Winter's Confession and the Gunpowder Plot* (Harper) an accurate reproduction of Winter's original confession, preserved by the Marquis of Salisbury at Hatfield, together with all other known specimens of the undoubted handwriting of Winter. Father Gerard's view of the plot is upheld by A. Bellesheim in an article in the *Historisch-politische Blätter*, CXXI. 8.

Mr. M. Oppenheim is preparing for the Navy Records Society a complete and revised edition of Sir William Monson's naval tracts. The revised edition is contemplated because of the extreme inaccuracy of the texts published in Churchill's *Voyages*.

Messrs. Goupil and Company expect to publish next spring an elaborately illustrated volume on Oliver Cromwell by Professor Samuel Rawson Gardiner, uniform with the Bishop of London's book on Queen Elizabeth, and that of the late Sir John Skelton on Charles I.

Mr. W. S. Douglas in his book on *Cromwell's Scotch Campaigns, 1650–51* (London, Elliot Stock, pp. 308) makes, with the aid of a minute knowledge of the topography and of the Scottish politics of the period, an important contribution to the history of the Great Rebellion.

The third volume of Mr. W. Laird Clowes's *The Royal Navy* is issued this fall by Messrs. Sampson, Low, Marston and Co. The period covered extends from 1714 to 1793, although the history of voyages and discoveries is continued to 1802. Captain Mahan describes the major operations from 1762 to 1793. The work will be completed in five volumes, ending with the year 1898.

The latest book issued by the Oxford Historical Society (Clarendon Press) is a fourth volume of the *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne*, extending from Dec. 15, 1712, to Nov. 30, 1714, and continuing his minute record of Oxford transactions.

Rev. John Hunt, author of an esteemed book on *Religious Thought in England in the Nineteenth Century*, is engaged in writing an account of the life and times of Bishop Hoadly, and of the historic controversies in which he was involved.

Much fresh matter of importance to the fiscal history of Great Britain is contained in a report recently laid on the table of the House of Commons, in which the officials of the National Debt Office for the first time present full details of the history of the funded public debt from 1694 to 1786. The book is mainly the work of Mr. A. T. King, chief clerk of the department.

The last volume published by the Scottish History Society is *The Journal and Papers of John Murray of Broughton*, who was secretary to Prince Charles Edward during the period of the Jacobite rising in 1745, and who subsequently saved himself by informing against Lovat and others. They have been edited by Mr. R. Fitzroy Bell from four volumes of manuscript journals and papers placed at the disposal of the Scottish History Society by Mr. Siddons Murray.

Mr. Andrew Lang has followed up his book on *Pickle the Spy*, noticed in a former volume of the Review (II. 570), by a series of eighteenth-century portraits chiefly relating to the rising of 1745, entitled *The Companions of Pickle*.

Mr. Evelyn Manners has been engaged for several years upon a life of the Marquis of Granby, British commander-in-chief during the Seven Years' War. It is expected to be published this autumn by the Messrs. Macmillan.

In view of the American origin of Count Rumford, founder of the Royal Institution, it will be of interest to many Americans to know that upon the occasion of the one-hundredth anniversary of that establishment, a history of the Institution by its librarian, Mr. Herbert C. Fyfe, will be published.

Messrs. Sampson, Low, Marston and Co. expect to publish this autumn a life of Admiral Lord Lyons, G.C.B., better known as Sir Edmund Lyons (father of Lord Lyons, British minister at Washington during the Civil War), written by Captain S. Eardley-Wilmot, R. N., from documents furnished to him by the Duke of Norfolk, whose mother was a daughter of that distinguished naval officer and diplomatist.

The *Memoir of Major-General Sir Henry Creswicke Rawlinson* by his brother the late Camden professor (Longmans, Green and Co.) not only is of high importance to the history of the East India Company and of Indian affairs during the long period during which Sir Henry Rawlinson was a member of the Council for India, but, as might be expected, contributes in an important degree to the history of European scholarship in the fields of Persian, Assyrian and Babylonian history and antiquities.

Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Henry Reeve, formerly editor of the *Edinburgh Review* and registrar of the Privy Council, edited by Professor J. K. Laughton and to be published by Longmans, Green and Co., are now in the press.

It was originally intended that the life of the late Lord Randolph Churchill should be written by Viscount Curzon, to whom all the necessary letters and papers were handed over. It is now announced, however, that Mr. Winston Churchill will undertake the task in the place of Lord Curzon.

The Rev. Archibald Macmillan, minister of Iona, has prepared a work on *Iona, its History, Antiquities*, etc., which is to be published by Messrs. Houlston and Sons. It will contain chapters on the carved stones of Iona by Mr. Robert Brydall of the St. George Art School, Glasgow.

Judge William O'Connor Morris, whose small book upon Irish history from 1494 to 1868 was noticed in the second volume of this REVIEW, has published a more detailed history of *Ireland from 1798 to 1898* (A. D. Innes and Co.)

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: K. Horst, *Die Angelsächsische Chronik* (Englische Studien, XXV. 1 and 2); W. C. Abbott, *Hasting* (English Historical Review, July); Abbé Feret, *Le premier Divorce de Henri VIII.* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July); A. F. Pollard, *The Protector Somerset and Scotland* (English Historical Review, July).

FRANCE.

To the *Collection de Textes pour servir à l'Étude et à l'Enseignement de l'Histoire* (Paris, Picard) M. G. Fagniez, whose book on the economic history of the reign of Henry IV. was reviewed in our last number, has added a first volume of *Documents relatifs à l'Histoire de l'Industrie et du Commerce en France.* This first volume extends to the end of the thirteenth century.

In the *Bulletin du Protestantisme Français*, LXXIX., M. N. Weiss makes a series of contributions to the history of Calvin, and M. A. Lefranc continues his essay on the religious ideas of Margaret of Navarre.

The Société des Études Historiques expects before long to issue a

Histoire de la Grande Industrie en France de 1715 à 1789, prepared from materials in the national and departmental archives by M. Germain Martin.

M. L. de Brotonne, though gleaning after the *Correspondance* and M. Léon Lecestre, in his *Lettres Inédites de Napoléon* (Paris, Champion), has nevertheless by diligent search in most various directions found material for a highly important volume.

The Société d' Histoire Contemporaine will publish during its present year the *Mémoires du Comte de Moré*, of which Balzac issued an edition, now rare, in 1827, and which has relations with the history of the United States; the interesting *Mémoire* of Pons de l' Hérault to the allied powers; and the first of two volumes, edited by M. Romberg, of *Documents relatifs aux Cent-Jours à Gand.* The second of these volumes is ready for the press, as is also the second volume of the *Mémoires de l'Abbé Baston.* The memoirs of M. de Salaberry and the correspondence of Le Coz with Grégoire are also promised for future publication.

M. Edmond Biré is understood to be preparing a critical and annotated edition of Chateaubriand's *Mémoires d' Outre-tombe.*

The centenary of Jules Michelet was celebrated at Paris on July 12 and 13 by official ceremonies, by the university bodies, and by the schools. The *prix d' éloquence* for a study of Michelet was awarded by the French Academy to M. Jean Brunhes, of the University of Fribourg, whose *étude* has been published by Perrin.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Imbart de la Tour, *Les Paroisses rurales dans l'ancienne France*, concl. (Revue Historique, September); Dedouvres, *Le Père Joseph Diplomate; Mémoires de quelques Discours Politiques*, 1617–1632 (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, 1898, 3); F. Funck-Brentano, *Les dernières Années de la Bastille d'après de nouveaux Documents* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July); F. A. Aulard, *L'Idée Républicaine et Démocratique avant 1789* (La Révolution Française, July 14); F. A. Aulard, *Les Origines du Parti Républicain* (Revue de Paris, May 1); E. Velwert, *Les derniers Conventionnels* (Revue Historique, September); J. B. Rye, *The Lost and New Letters of Napoleon* (English Historical Review, July).

ITALY AND SPAIN.

Fasc. I.–II. of Vol. XXI. of the *Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria* contains an article by F. Pagnotti on Niccolò da Calvi and his *Vita d'Innocenzo IV.*, with introductory remarks on the pontifical historiography of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and a collection of documents, edited by M. Rosi, on the liberation of the Turkish prisoners taken at the battle of Lepanto.

Professor J. H. Robinson, of Columbia University, has in the press of Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons a volume on Petrarch, containing a selection from his correspondence with Boccaccio and other friends, translated and annotated in such a manner as to illustrate the beginnings of the Renaissance.

In commemoration of the fourth centenary of the martyrdom of Savonarola, Professor Pasquale Villari and Professor Casanova have published a volume of selected pages from Savonarola's sermons and writings, together with extracts from inedited contemporary documents throwing light upon his career. The volume is entitled: *Scelta di Prediche e Scritti, con nuovi Documenti intorno alla sua Vita*, and is published in Florence by Sansoni.

In a pamphlet of 79 pages entitled *Zur Beurteilung Savonarolas; Kritische Streifzüge* (Freiburg i. B., Herder) Dr. Ludwig Pastor defends the positions he took in his *Geschichte der Päpste* against the criticisms of Commer, Procter, Ferretti and Luotto. The pamphlet has been translated into Italian. Pastor's side in the controversy has been taken by Brüll in the April number of *Der Katholik*, and by Michael in the *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, XXII. 2. A more moderate Catholic view is taken by Schnitzer in the *Historisch-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland*, CXXI. 7–11.

The second section of Mr. Robert Proctor's *Index to the Early Printed Books of the British Museum* deals exclusively with Italy, and contains nearly 4,200 entries, against 3,200 in the first section, which deals with Germany.

An edition of the correspondence of Murat, *Carteggio di Gioacchino Murat*, will shortly be published by Roux and Co., of Turin.

The Milanese committee for the Museo del Risorgimento Nazionale, in co-operation with the municipal government of Milan, have commemorated the fiftieth anniversary of the Five Days by the publication of a *Bibliografia Storica delle Cinque Giornate del Marzo 1848* (Milan, Giacomo Agnelli, pp. 275) edited by Signor Antonio Vismara. It takes notice of books, articles, bulletins, manifestos, circulars, inscriptions, pieces of music, etc.

The autobiography of General Enrico della Rocca, mentioned in these pages in an earlier issue, has been put into English in an abridged translation by Mrs. Janet Ross, and is to be published in London by T. Fisher Unwin.

Messrs. Small, Maynard and Company, of Boston, have published a volume on the *Spanish Revolution, 1868–1875*, by Hon. Edward Henry Strobel, the newly elected professor of international law in Harvard University, who was for some years a secretary of the United States legation at Madrid.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Pometti, *Per la Storia della Marina Italiana* (Rivista Marittima, March–April); Desdevises du Dezert, *La Marine Espagnole pendant la Campagne de Trafalgar* (Revue des Pyrénées, 1898, 1 and 2).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND.

The principal official German historical publications of the past quarter have been Part IV. of Vol. XIII. of the *Auctores Antiquissimi* (M. H. G.) finishing Mommsen's edition of the minor chronicles of the fourth–seventh centuries; and a second *Lieferung* (1433–1437) of Vol. II. of the *Urkunden Kaiser Sigmunds* (*Regesta Imperii* XI.), edited by Dr. Wilhelm Altmann.

At the last general meeting of the board of directors of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* it was announced that the following were in press: *Liber Pontificalis* I., ed. Th. Mommsen; *Monumenta Erphesfurtensia saec. XII., XIII., XIV.*, ed Holder-Egger; *Deutsche Chroniken*, Bd. III., ed. Strauch; *Diplomata Henrici II.; Registrum Gregorii II.; Epistolae* V.; *Necrologia Germaniae* II.; *Poetae Latini* IV. The following are nearly ready for the press; *Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum* IV., ed. Krusch; *Leges Visigothorum*, ed. Zeumer; *Constitutiones Regum et Imperatorum* III., ed. Schwalm. Professor Seemüller of Innsbruck was entrusted with the editing of the Austrian chronicles, Dr. Meyer of Göttingen with the collecting of historical songs and "sayings," Dr. Werminghoff with the collecting of material on the Carolingian synods, and Professor Tangl with a similar task in relation to the judicial documents of the Franks and Lombards.

Dr. G. von Below makes Lamprecht's methods the subject of a long article, *Die neue historische Methode*, in the *Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXXI. 2. W. Oncken deals with the same much-debated theme in a pamphlet called *Lamprecht's Vertheidigung* (Berlin, E. Brückmann, pp. 48). Still another contribution to the discussion is Dr. Hermann Barge's *Entwicklung der geschichtswissenschaftlichen Anschauungen in Deutschland* (Leipzig, Dieterich, pp. 36).

Professors H. E. von Holst and B. S. Terry, of the University of Chicago, are preparing a *Brief German History*, for use in schools and colleges.

At the twenty-eighth annual meeting of the Hansischer Geschichtsverein, which took place at Einbeck on May 31 and June 1, it was announced that during the coming year the association expected to publish three volumes: Vol. VI. of the third series of the *Hanserecesse*, edited by D. Schäfer, and extending to 1516; Vol. V. of the first series of the *Hansisches Urkundenbuch*, edited by K. Kunze, and extending to 1414; and Vol. I. (1451–1463) of the second series of the latter, edited by W. Stein.

Through the house of B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, Dr. Erich Brandenburg, *privatdozent*, in the university of that town, publishes the first volume of an important work on *Moritz von Sachsen*. This volume (pp. 558) extends to the Capitulation of Wittenberg (1547).

A manual recently issued of which many readers may be glad to know, is Dr. Wilhelm Altmann's *Ausgewählte Urkunden zur deutschen*

Verfassungsgeschichte seit 1806, in two volumes of small cost (Berlin, R. Gaertner, pp. 312, 213).

The semi-centennial commemoration of the revolutionary days of 1848 has elicited an illustrated history by Hans Blum, *Die deutsche Revolution, 1848–50* (Leipzig, Diederichs); an article by Max Lenz in the *Preussische Jahrbücher* for March; one by Erich Marcks in Velhagen and Klasing's *Monatshefte*, XXI. 2; one by A. Buchholz on the contemporary historical writings on the event, in the *Deutsche Rundschau* for March; an article by Karl Frenzel in the same number, and one by Karl Biedermann in *Nord und Süd* for January. The last two are by writers who were eye-witnesses and in a sense participants.

In the series of "Heroes of the Nations," Mr. J. W. Headlam, of King's College, Cambridge, who has already written a history of modern Germany, issues a volume on *Bismarck and the New German Empire*, upon which he had been engaged for four years before Bismarck's death.

One of the most interesting and important of recent brief contributions to the knowledge of Bismarck is *Persönliche Erinnerungen an den Fürsten Bismarck*, by Christoph von Tiedemann, formerly a principal official of the imperial chancery (Leipzig, Hirzel, pp. 52).

In the *Nationalzeitung* of May 22 and 27, June 1 and 3, Dr. Tempeltey published characteristic and important portions of the correspondence of Duke Ernst of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha with King William, the Crown Prince and Mensdorff in the spring of 1866. These are now reprinted: *Herzog Ernst von Koburg und das Jahr 1866* (Berlin, H. Paetel, pp. 72).

A documentary publication of great magnitude, supported by the Austrian government, has lately been planned. It is to bear the general title of *Akten und Korrespondenzen zur neueren (vorzugsweise politischen) Geschichte Oesterreichs*, and is to consist of four series, relating respectively to the correspondence of sovereigns, to that of statesmen, to the reports of foreign envoys, and to treaties.

A co-operative history of Switzerland in the most modern times, *Die Schweiz im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, to be published by Schmid and Franke of Berne and F. Payot of Lausanne, and to be completed in three volumes, is in course of preparation by a number of Swiss historical writers, under the editorial supervision of Professor Paul Seippel of the Federal Polytechnicum at Zurich.

The *Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de Genève*, Tome II., livr. 1, contains the text of a charter for the founding of a university, given between 1418 and 1422 by Pope Martin V. to Jean de Rochetaillée, patriarch of Constantinople, commendatory bishop of Geneva,— a document discovered by Professor Charles Borgeaud in his official researches for the history of the University of Geneva; also an interesting account of the cantonal archives from 1814 to the present time, by the present archivist, M. Louis Dufour-Vernes.

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM.

Professor P. J. Blok's *History of the Dutch People,* of which the original has been reviewed by us (II. 122) has been translated into English by Professor O. A. Bierstadt and Miss Ruth Putnam; the first volume of the translation will shortly be published by Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Dr. Felix Rachfahl's *Margaretha von Parma, Statthalterin der Niederlande (1559–1567),* the fifth volume in the *Historische Bibliothek* published by the editors of the *Historische Zeitschrift* (Munich, R. Oldenbourg, pp. 276) is a careful study, partly based on materials drawn from the archives at Brussels, and preliminary to a larger work on the earlier period of the revolt of the Netherlands.

The Royal Historical Commission of Belgium has in press the third volume of the cartulary of St. Lambert of Liège; Mr. Gilliodts van Severen's eleventh volume on the political relations betweeen the Low Countries and England; the cartulary of the Van Arteveldes, ed. de Pauw; and the cartulary of St. Hubert, ed. Kurth. M. Henri Pirenne will edit for the Commission a collection of sources relating to the history of the woolen industry in Flanders.

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE.

A German translation, *Geschichte der isländischen Geographie* (Leipzig, B. G. Teubner) makes accessible Th. Thoroddsen's treatise on the geography of Iceland and its history.

The *Recueil d'Actes Internationaux de l'Empire Ottoman,* by Gabriel Effendi Norodounghian, is intended to give summaries of all treaties of Turkey with other powers, full texts of those which are important, and references to, or texts of, such state papers as are especially adapted to illustrate them. The first volume (Paris, Leipzig, Neufchatel, pp. 412) contains treaties from 1300 to 1789.

Vol. X. (XXIX.) of the Rumanian Academy's *Documente privitóre la Istoria Româmilor,* edited by Dr. Neculai Jorga (pp. 694), is chiefly occupied with the reports of the Prussian consuls in Jassy and Bucharest in the period from 1763 to 1844, interesting with respect to Rumanian history and the relations of the principalities to Prussia.

AMERICA.

The autumn list of Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin and Co. includes four new volumes in the American Statesmen Series: Chief Justice Chase, by Professor Hart, of Harvard; Sumner, by Mr. Moorfield Storey; Thaddeus Stevens, by Hon. Samuel W. McCall; and Charles Francis Adams, by his son of the same name. A volume on *John Adams, the Statesman of the American Revolution,* by Judge Mellen Chamberlain, is at the same time announced, and the first volume (1752–1761) of *Letters to George Washington,* mostly hitherto unpublished, edited by Mr. S. M. Hamilton of the Department of State.

No. 6 in the sixteenth series of the *Johns Hopkins University Studies* consists of a monograph on Anti-Slavery Leaders in North Carolina, by Professor John S. Bassett, of Trinity College. Nos. 7–9 consist of an interesting and valuable monograph on the life and administration of Sir Robert Eden, the last proprietary governor of Maryland, by Dr. Bernard C. Steiner (pp. 142).

No. IX. in the series of *Papers from the Historical Seminary of Brown University* is a paper on the Government of Federal Territories in Europe, by Dr. E. C. Burnett, instructor in that institution; No. X. will be a monograph on the Council of Censors in Pennsylvania and Vermont, by Mr. Lewis H. Meader.

The late Mr. William S. Baker fortunately completed before his death his chronological itinerary and record of Washington's private and official life from 1784 to 1799, which has now been printed (Philadelphia, Lippincott) under the title *Washington after the Revolution.*

Rev. J. L. Seward has nearly ready for the press a history of the town of Sullivan, New Hampshire.

Nos. 87 and 88 of the *Old South Leaflets* present that portion of Morton's *New English Canaan* which deals with the manners and customs of the Indians, and the pages of Hubbard's *Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians* which describe the beginning and the ending of King Philip's War.

Under the title *Pictures of Rhode Island in the Past*, Miss Gertrude S. Kimball, author of a brief account of the East India trade of Providence, has prepared a series of extracts from old writers—travellers and others—describing Rhode Island, Providence or Newport, as they saw them in colonial or later times; the extracts are supplied with explanatory introductions and notes, and the volume is to be published by Messrs. Preston and Rounds of Providence.

The same firm also announce a life of *Esek Hopkins, Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Navy 1775 to 1778*, by Mr. Edward Field; the edition is limited.

The diary of the Rev. James MacSparran, who was one of the earliest rectors of St. Paul's Church in Narragansett, is about to be printed by Mr. Daniel Berkeley Updike at the Merrymount Press. The diary, which has for some time been possessed by the diocese of Rhode Island, extends from the year 1743 to 1751.

Yale University intends, as a part of the commemoration of its two-hundredth anniversary, to print in a series of volumes the *Diary* of President Stiles, well known to be rich in items of interest to the student of New England history. It is proposed to print the diary substantially in full, with illustrative notes from his other manuscripts; Dr. Franklin B. Dexter will be the editor.

The Connecticut Historical Society has received some 160 volumes of New York, Washington, Richmond and Hartford newspapers of the period 1820–1860.

The *Bulletins* of the New York Public Library from May to September continue the calendar of the Emmet Collection relating to the signers of the Declaration of Independence. In addition they print the texts of an interesting letter of Jefferson, 1766, giving an account of the Maryland Assembly (May), bits of the records of the Confederate attorneys-general and a letter of Samuel Adams on the Boston Port Bill (June), a letter of James Sullivan, 1796, on the Northeast Boundary (July); the Massachusetts proposals of 1773 for colonial committees of correspondence (August), and a letter of McKean to Caesar Rodney (September). The June number completes the calendar of Washington's copy-press letters possessed by the library, with an index and a list affording comparison with those possessed by the Department of State. The July number has a list of publications on New York affairs under Governor Cosby, 1732–1736, and a catalogue of the library's pamphlets on the French Revolution.

The Astor Library has lately been enriched by the presentation of a collection of volumes and pamphlets on the South Sea Bubble so extensive as to number 421 separate items.

Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons have just issued the first volume of the elaborate history of Trinity Church, New York City, a sumptuous book provided for by vote of the corporation, and edited by Dr. Morgan Dix, the rector of the church. The whole work will consist of three volumes.

Moses King of New York has lately issued a *Handbook of the Courts and Judges of New York City. their History and Functions, with Notes and Reminiscences of Judges and Lawyers*, by A. Oakey Hall.

The July number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* contains an interesting body of extracts from the letter-book of Captain Johann Heinrichs, of the Hessian Jäger Corps, 1778–1780, the manuscript of which has lately been acquired by the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Mr. H. M. Jenkins's account of the family of William Penn is continued, as also the orderly-book of the Pennsylvania State Regiment of Foot.

The Colonial Society of Pennsylvania have carried out the intention of which we have spoken in a former issue by publishing a first volume of their reprint of the *American Weekly Mercury*, beginning in 1719. The facsimile has been prepared under the care of Mr. Julius F. Sachse, and is accompanied by an elaborate index. The work will be carried forward at the rate of two volumes a year. The address of the committee of publication is 1208 Betz Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

The Board of Publication of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America has caused the publication, in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, of a *Documentary History* of that ministerium, containing the proceedings of its annual conventions from 1748 to 1821, carefully transcribed, translated and annotated, with indexes of subjects, of ministers, of lay delegates' names, and of place-names.

Professor Oscar Kuhns, of Wesleyan University, has nearly finished a work on the Pennsylvania Germans, in which he will trace the history of their life in Germany, their emigration, their settlement in Pennsylvania and their religious and social development in subsequent times.

The July number of the *Publications of the Southern History Association* has for its most important contents an article on Christopher Gadsden, by Mr. E. I. Renick, and one by Mr. B. W. Arnold on Virginia women in the Civil War. The Society intends to publish a much-needed index to Bishop Meade's *Old Churches, Ministers and Families of Virginia*. Subscriptions may be sent to the secretary, Dr. Colyer Meriwether, P. O. Box 665, Washington, D. C.

The July number of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* contains interesting extracts from the Carter papers, from the Journal of John Barnwell, from the letters of William Fitzhugh, and from the letters of Lafayette to Governor Jefferson in 1781.

In the *Lower Norfolk County Virginia Antiquary*, No. 2, Part 3, the most important new matter relates to church affairs in 1649 and 1650. Matter relating to the burning of Norfolk by the Americans in 1776 and to Grace Sherwood the witch is reprinted from other places. There is a list of harp and piano owners in Portsmouth (Va.) in 1855, taken from the report of a commissioner of revenue.

Professor Charles Lee Raper has published in book-form a series of articles on *The Church and Private Schools of North Carolina* (Greensborough, J. J. Stone, pp. 245), which he has been contributing to a local college paper.

A serious effort is being made to revive interest in the Alabama Historical Society. Its officers intend to issue, as soon as possible, the first volume of its *Transactions*, embracing papers read at various times since its organization in 1850, and before long a second volume containing the papers read at the annual meeting of June 21, 1898. Appeal is made for subscriptions and other aid. The secretary, Mr. T. M. Owen, announces a history of Jefferson County, Alabama, 1814–1898, to be published by him at Carrollton.

The July number of the *Quarterly* of the Texas State Historical Association contains an interesting sketch of the life of Judge O. M. Roberts, late president of the society, an article on the old fort at Anahuac, by Adèle B. Looscan, and the beginning of a sketch of the judicial history of Texas, by Hon. John C. Townes. The books and manuscripts on Texan history collected by Judge Roberts have been bequeathed by him to the State University.

The fortunes of the Scioto Company and of the Société des Vingt-Quatre are studied, from the papers of M. du Val d'Éprémesnil, in the *Revue de Paris* of May 15, by M. Henri Carré.

The *Annals of Iowa*, in its double number for April–July, contains a history of Fort Des Moines, a series of reminiscences of Gen. James Parrott, and an account of the battle of Pleasant Hill by three Iowa officers. The General Assembly has made an appropriation for the purchase of a suitable site for an imposing historical building for the state.

Col. Henry Inman, U. S. A., whose *Old Santa Fé Trail* was recently reviewed in this journal, has brought out another book of a similar character on *The Great Salt Lake Trail* (Macmillan), in which he has been assisted by Col. W. F. Cody, better known as "Buffalo Bill."

The government printing office has issued a descriptive list entitled *Alaska and the Northwest Part of North America, 1588–1898: Maps in the Library of Congress* (pp. 101), by Mr. P. Lee Phillips, superintendent of maps and charts in that library.

Mr. A. P. C. Griffin, assistant librarian of Congress, has prepared a list of books and articles relating to Hawaii, similar to the Cuban list heretofore mentioned in these pages (Government Printing Office).

Mr. Beckles Willson has nearly ready for publication a history of the Hudson Bay Company, entitled *Prince Rupert, His Land and His Company during Two Centuries*. The book, though popular in tone, is based upon studies of the original sources, and in some cases of archive material hitherto inaccessible.

The late Don José Fernando Ramirez left a manuscript of *Adiciones y Correcciones* to Beristain y Souza's *Bibliotheca Hispano-Americana*. These have now been printed (Mexico, Victoriano Agüeros, pp. xlvii, 662), with a life of Ramirez by D. Luis Gonzalez Obregon.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: T. K. Urdahl, *The Relation of the Colonial Fee-System to Political Liberty* (Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, July); C. K. Adams, *Some Neglected Aspects of the Revolutionary War* (Atlantic, August); A. B. Hart, *The Experience of the United States in Foreign Military Expeditions* (Harper's Magazine, September); J. M. Morgan, *The Confederacy's Only Foreign War* (Century, August); J. T. Mason, *The Last of the Confederate Cruisers* (Century, August); F. Bancroft, *Seward's Ideas of Territorial Expansion* (North American Review, July).

Volume IV] *January, 1899* [*Number 2*

The

American Historical Review

THE FRENCH REFORMATION AND THE FRENCH PEOPLE IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

THE Reformation had the two-fold character of a social and of a religious revolution. It was not solely against doctrinal corruptions and against ecclesiastical abuses, but also against misery and iniquity that the lower classes rebelled; they sought in the Bible not only for the doctrine of salvation by grace, but for proofs of the primitive equality of all men.

> "When Adam delved and Eve span
> Who was then the gentleman?"

In Germany the works of Janssen have shown the immense part played in the Reformation by the peasants' revolts. It was poor Conrad, "der arme Kunz," who gave the victory to Luther, despite the anathema which the Saxon monk pronounced upon that troublesome ally. In England it is a commonplace to say with Thorold Rogers that the strength of the Reformation was due "to the secret Lollardry, which seemed to be extinguished and was so active," and that "the Puritan movement was essentially and originally one of the middle classes, of the traders in the towns, of the farmers in the country." [1]

I.

Did matters take another course in France? Our historians usually see in the Huguenot party above all else a party of noblemen. They think that the aristocracy preferred the rigidity of Protestantism to the pomp of the Roman Church; and that if the new religion did not triumph in France, it was because it could get no hold upon the popular classes.[2] Yet Michelet had said: "In the sixteenth century at Meaux . . . was kindled the first spark in the religious revolution."[1] He observed also that in Crespin's martyrology one finds "but three nobles in forty years (1515–1555); . . . the others are generally poor workmen, burgesses and merchants."[2] An American writer, who has thrown a vivid light upon this portion of French history, Professor Henry M. Baird, remarked more recently that Louis de Berquin, executed so late as 1528, was the first in date, amongst the "martyrs," who was a "man of quality."[3] He mentions the indignant surprise shown by Henry II. in 1558 on hearing that the Chastillons, who belonged to the aristocracy, had embraced a religion fit only for low people.[4] In 1561, the Venetian envoy Giovanni Michiel wrote: "Till now, owing to the severity of the tortures, none have been seen to come forward but common people who, besides their lives, had not much to lose" . . .[5] Does not the Catholic historian Florimond Raemond say that the first adherents of the new doctrine were "a few poor, simple men, . . . working men," and "even such as had never done aught but handle the plough and dig the ground?"[6] He rails with bitter irony at those men of low degree, ignorant, illiterate, who "at a moment's notice become excellent theologians." But is not this very banter an involuntary admission of the fact that amongst these "wretched penny-earners" the Reformation found its first partisans?

---

[1] *The Economic Interpretation of History*, p. 84. See also Taine, *Hist. de la Littérature Anglaise*, II. 301.

[1] Aug. Thierry, *Hist. du Tiers État*, p. 111. Mignet, *Essais*, pp. 256–262.

An indirect proof of this affirmation lies in the very means which the new doctrine employed in its propagation. If its hold had been merely upon a public composed of men of letters and scholars it would have continued to publish long tracts in Latin, as Le Febvre d' Étaples had begun to do. Had it relied for support mainly upon the nobility it would have spoken in its sermons and books the polished language of the court. Now, what do we see in fact? As early as 1525 the bishop of Meaux is reproached for having distributed in his diocese "books in French which were all error and heresy."[7] The translation of the Bible happening to be one of them, these early heretics obtained the nickname of "Biblians." We find, too, an ever-increasing number of pamphlets for the people, such as "*Alphabets for the simple and rude*,"[8] wherein, under pretext of teaching the children the rudiments of reading, they are initiated into the doctrine of grace; translations of the minor tracts of Luther;[1] collections of Protestant prayers. Thousands of these little books were issued by the clandestine presses of Meaux and Alençon, by the Protestant presses of Lyons and Geneva. Although they were not infrequently burned with their owners, many of them are to be found in our libraries. These little books found their way into the peddler's pack, under the trinkets and sweets, and were thus circulated from village to village; more than one peddler paid with his life for the guilt of having transported those forbidden wares. In a barn, at night by the dim light of the candle—for they must not raise suspicion—or by daylight in the forest glade, at the "*école buissonière*," the illiterate gathered around him who could read. He was a vicar or a monk, brought over to the new ideas, or sometimes a schoolmaster or a lawyer, barrister, proctor or notary; he would read, and around him hardheaded peasants, the women that span, the children with large, wondering eyes, muttered inwardly the strong words of the Bible, or the exhortations of the theologian; from that day, in some obscure corner of "the most Christian Kingdom," a Protestant community was born.

---

[1] *Histoire de France* (ed. 1876), X. 155.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 337; and XI. 74, 78.

[3] *History of the Rise of the Huguenots*, I. 318.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] *Relazioni degli Ambasciatori Veneti in Francia*, III. 425.

[6] *Histoire...de l'Hérésie de ce Siècle*, Rouen, 1623, pp. 845, 851, 871–873.

[7] S. Berger, *Procès de Briçonnet* (in *Bulletin Historique du Protestantisme Français*, 15 jan., 1895).

[8] *Alphabet ou Institution Chrestienne*. . . . Lyons, 1558.

But the book is not enough for the popular mind; the people in France are fond of singing while they work. All those who were unable to read—and such was then the case with nearly all Frenchmen of the lower classes—would ponder within themselves on what they had heard read by the learned man of the village or of their quarter of the town. All day long, while driving the plough "o'er the furrowed land" or throwing the shuttle at the loom, they would repeat over again, under their breath, the words that had most deeply impressed them; those words caught the very rhythm of their labor, and a song would shape itself upon their lips. The existence of a vast literature of Huguenot songs would alone suffice to prove the existence of a popular Protestantism; for those songs, such are their words, style and rhythm, can only have been written for the common people and sung by them.[2]

How is it that the contrary opinion still prevails? Why is the statement constantly repeated in France that the French Reformation was an aristocratic movement? At most it is conceded—because it is too strikingly obvious to be denied—that the burghers of the towns, the lawyers and the masters of crafts played an important part in it. But why is the part played by the popular classes ignored? There are three reasons:

---

[1] Weiss, *Bull. du Protest. Franç.*, 1887, p. 664; 1888, pp. 155, 432, 500.

[2] Bordier, *Chansonnier Huguenot*, I. pp. xiv, xxviii; Montaiglon, *Recueil des Poésies Françaises;* Le Roux de Lincy, *Chants Historiques Français.*

First, it is usual to study the Reformation after 1560 only, at the time, that is, when it almost ceases to be a religious revolution and becomes a political party; and then, indeed, it is, so to speak, captured by the gentry;

Secondly, the Catholics are loath to recognize in the French Reformation a popular movement, for to do so would invest it with additional importance, would amount to a confession that it was deeply rooted in the national soil, and would make it in the future impossible to regard it as a foreign importation, a superficial or factitious growth;

Thirdly, the Protestants are upon this point at one with the Catholics,[1] for a kind of shame hinders them from conceding that the Reformation was a social revolution; they would see in it a purely intellectual, spiritual movement; they put aside all the impure, blind, violent, sometimes criminal elements which the intervention of the mob introduces into every revolution; in their view, ideas alone were at work in the Reformation, the interests and passions had no part.

II.

M. Hanotaux, after studying in his well-known *Histoire du Cardinal de Richelieu* the social state of the French workmen at the beginning of the seventeenth century, notes with perfect justice "the rapidity with which the working classes gave in their adherence to the Reformation."[2] It is, indeed, in the situation of this class that we shall find the cause of its attitude towards the religious innovations.

That situation was by no means enviable. The discovery of gold and silver mines, increasing considerably the stock of the precious metals in Europe, had caused a rise in the price of the necessities of life; and the wages of the workmen were far from rising in the same proportion. The guild system, which in the thirteenth century had been the protection of the weak, was tending more and more to become oppressively oligarchical; the management of manufactures became the monopoly of a rich, and in fact, hereditary caste. It was nearly impossible for a simple workman who was not a master's son nor supplied with capital to rise to the mastership. Conflicts between labor and capital were therefore frequent: combinations of the "companions" to obtain higher wages or better food; combinations of the "masters," who wished to control the labor market; and this in spite of the royal edicts that positively suppressed the right of combination. The struggle between the employers' unions and those of the workingmen often ended in strikes; for instance, that great strike which, raging from 1539 to 1542, ruined the printing trade in Lyons and Paris and was not really appeased until 1571.[1]

---

[1] I must except some of them, especially Mons. N. Weiss.

[2] I. 473. See Levasseur, *Histoire des Classes Ouvrières*, II. *passim.*

The workers' world was therefore a dissatisfied and turbulent one, eager for novelties, extremely apt to listen to revolutionary preaching. The development of French industries had drawn to France many foreign workmen, Flemish, Italian and especially German who brought along with them foreign ideas. Moreover, the social agitation, especially in the great and mystical city of Lyons, was oftentimes mixed with religious agitation. For instance, at Lyons in 1529 the people rebelled on account of the extraordinary rise in the price of corn. They besieged and plundered the houses of the *consuls* (town councillors), whom they declared responsible for the famine; but they took care to destroy the statues of the saints with which one of these houses was adorned, while they spared the statues of the great men of antiquity, and the whole rising bears a strange religious character, as it were a revival of the old "Poor Men of Lyons."[2]

But long before this date the Reformed creeds had struck root among the working classes. At Meaux in 1525 Gerard Roussel had for his auditors the woolcombers, the carders, the fullers and drapers, drapery being the great industry of the town. One of these fullers was to be next year, at Metz in Lorraine, the first martyr of the French Reformation. The prelates, as Briçonnet, the scholars, the gentlemen, dared not offer their lives as a sacrifice for the new doctrine; but the humble worker, "ignorant in letters," would proclaim his faith at the stake. In 1528 a boatman of the Seine was executed at Paris, in 1531 some linen-weavers at Valenciennes. Above all, in the great persecution of 1534–1535, after the posting of the placards against the mass in the very room of the King, many names of workmen can be quoted.[3] First, it is a shoemaker's son, the young paralytic Barthélemy Mollon; in his father's shop the poor cripple, while plying the awl, would read secretly the forbidden books: he explained them to his fellow-workmen, wherefore they had surnamed him "the Evangelist." Next it is a weaver, a hosier, a young dyer, a tailor, a shoemaker, a joiner, two ribbon-wearers. In the Limousin, some artisans coming from Flanders and Germany seem to have spread heresy among the industrious population of Aubusson and Felletin.[1] At Le Puy-en-Velay, an eminently Catholic township, renowned throughout all Europe for its pilgrimage of the Virgin, a Catholic chronicler writes in 1539 that three-fourths of the people are tainted.[2] No doubt his estimate is too high, but he would not have thought of putting it thus if there had not been among the lower classes, as a matter of fact, a large Protestant group. At Bordeaux two artisans were burnt alive in 1541.[3]

---

[1] Hauser in the *Revue Internationale de Sociologie*, 1894, 1895, 1898.

[2] Hauser, *Revue Historique*, 1896.

[3] *Bourgeois de Paris*, pp. 441–451; *Chronique de François Ier*, pp. 111–136; *Bull. du Protest.*, XI. 252.

Notwithstanding the persecutions of 1525–1526, the seed had persistently sprung up among the working classes at Meaux. It appeared clearly in 1545–1546 during the investigation preliminary to the trial which resulted in the execution of the Fourteen and of which Mr. Bower has given us so engaging a narrative.[4] Upon the list of the fifty-seven suspects one reads none but plebeian names, and the world of carders and weavers again furnishes to the Inquisition its victims. A proof that the ranks of the dissenters were recruited chiefly from among them is that after 1546 the cloth trade of Meaux, hitherto prosperous, was ruined. M. N. Weiss has published under the title *La Chambre Ardente*[5] the trials for heresy conducted by the Parliament of Paris in 1547, 1548 and 1549. Here again, the names are nearly always plebeian. The occupation of the accused is generally stated; they are, for the most part, weavers, fullers, shoemakers and cobblers, glaziers, bookbinders, hosiers, servants and chambermaids, locksmiths, coopers, tailors, pastry-cooks, joiners, peddlers, pewterers, masons, hatters, etc. All crafts are represented.

Bernard Palissy, "the potter of Saintonge," belonged to this class, and he has left us an account of what would take place. A poor artizan of Saintes preaches "the Gospel" to ten of his fellows. Six of them agree to preach on Sundays, each taking his turn once in six weeks; and being very ignorant they write their sermons beforehand, with the help of an ex-priest who has turned printer, and they read them. "Such was the beginning of the Reformed Church in the town of Saintes."[6] It is a church of poor people; when they get a minister they cannot maintain him, "as there were few rich men in our congregation, and we could not afford to pay him his wages." But if money was scarce, their hearts were in the cause, and on Sundays the journeymen would stroll about the country in troops singing psalms.

---

[1] A. Leroux, *Hist. de la Réforme dans la Marche et le Limousin*, p. 5.

[2] Estienne Médicis, *Chronique du Puy*, p. 502. He is here speaking of the French people in general. But he mentions heretics at Le Puy, pp. 387, 509–513.

[3] Gaullieur, *Hist. du Parlement de Bordeaux*, I. 57.

[4] *The Fourteen of Meaux*, London and New York, 1894.

[5] Paris, 1889.

[6] *Bull. du Protest.*, I. 83–93.

In truth, the transformation of these primitive congregations into regularly constituted churches, on the model (especially after 1550) of that of Geneva, did not immediately alter their frankly democratic character. When an inquiry was set on foot, in 1562, against the church of Beauvais, it was ascertained that for three years that church had had for its members drapers and woolcombers.[1] At Rouen, in 1560, the labor-party has become identified with the Reformed party; the cloth merchants, *i. e.*, the capitalists, actually proclaimed a lock-out against the workmen that attended the preachings. A truly revolutionary agitation fermented in that great industrial city, and presently found a vent for itself, as at La Rochelle, in the breaking of holy images.[2] At Nîmes a locksmith, a gardener, weavers, a carder, a coppersmith, a huckster, chambermaids are persecuted; at Issoire in Auvergne a cobbler, tailors, masons, bakers;[3] at Le Puy, 1561, hosiers, cutlers, dyers, millers. Even at a later date this often is the case; in 1561, at Cambray, cambric-weavers, hosiers, shoemakers, etc., are examined.[4]

When religious persecutions threaten, the working classes emigrate. Nothing binds them to the land. A few tools and his two arms constitute all the capital of the workman; he carries them into countries where he can worship God in his own way and in his own speech. The ruin of French industries in the second half of the century is, for the most part, to be thus explained.[5] We have already seen that no cloth-trade is left at Meaux after the trial of the Fourteen. The production of the Paris dye-works falls off by four-fifths; Amiens weaves no more; Lyons has but eighteen hundred silk looms instead of seven thousand, and printing is decaying there. It is an earlier manifestation of the phenomenon which was to follow the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the transferring of French industries to foreign lands. Montchrestien, an exile in England, works in a cutlery-house, where he meets French refugees. "England," says he, "has been so well taught by the skill of our men who have fled there for safety as to a harbor of refuge, that now she practises with glory and profit those same arts that we had long kept as our own.[6] . . ." In the cloth manufactory of Hampton (Middlesex) he was "much surprised to hear, in almost every workship, nothing but the French tongue." And even if poverty, the inevitable outcome of civil war, had driven out of France workmen of all persuasions, yet none but Reformed people appear among the French refugees entered upon the books of Lausanne from 1547 to 1574.[1] Among them the craftsmen are very numerous, and they come from every part of France; for instance a gunsmith from St.-Étienne-en-Forez, a baker from the Tardenois, a shoemaker from the Velay, a pewterer from Flanders, a joiner from Joinville in Champagne, a cutler from Annecy in Savoy, etc.

---

[1] *Bull. du Protest.*, XXIII. 73.

[2] *Hist. Ecclés. des Églises Réf.*, I. 310.

[3] Puech, *Renaissance et Réforme à Nîmes*, p. 152; Bouillet, *Annales d'Issoire.*

[4] *Bull. du Protest.*, III. 255.

[5] Smiles, *Huguenots in England;* Levasseur, *Hist. des Classes Ouvrières*, II.

[6] *Traicté de l' Œconomie Politique* (ed. by Funck-Brentano, 1889), pp. 48, 63; Laffemas, *Reiglement Général* . . . 1597, p. 20.

The Venetian Contarini was therefore quite right when he wrote in 1572, "That sect consists for the most part of craftsmen, as cobblers, tailors, and such ignorant people. . . ."[2]

III.

It is not to be denied that the new religious tenets spread far more slowly and found much less favor among the country-folk than among the townspeople. The reason for this is, first, a social one: while the revolution of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was ruinous for the artisan, it was profitable to the peasant.[3] The rent paid to the landlord, immutably fixed in the twelfth or thirteenth century, represented under the new values of money a very light burden, while the fall in the price of silver considerably raised the nominal worth of the products of the soil, when the villein sold them. The price of land was falling rapidly at the very time when the French gentry, ceasing to be an aristocracy of gentlemen-farmers and becoming a court-nobility, were compelled to sell their estates to meet their expenses and, as was said, "to put their mills and meadows on their shoulders." When a lord wished to sell at any price a part of his estates, there was always, in the parish, a countryman who had been, as one may say, saving money for centuries, and who, realizing at last the dream of bygone generations, bought land. Thus did the French villein become a landowner. The reign of Louis XII. and the beginning of that of Francis I. was for the French countryman an epoch of real prosperity; his situation presented a striking contrast with that of the German countryman, who, at the same date, was in danger of relapsing into bondage. We may easily understand why there was not in France, as in Germany, a peasants' revolution both social and religious.

The countryman, as he appears to us in the literature of that time, for instance in the *Propos Rustiques* of Noël du Fail, is a being who acts by routine, with a mind not easily open to new ideas, less accessible, therefore, than that of the turbulent craftsmen to the great currents of the time. He sticks to his old superstitions, whose root lies in the ancient Gallic heathenism, and which the Church has known how to transmute and to appropriate to its own purposes; he reveres the local saint, the saint of the wood, the mountain or the spring; he trusts to the tutelary ceremonies that bring rain or sunshine, keep away drought or hail, protect the cattle against mysterious diseases. He ever conceives of religion as a contract between superior beings, who have a right to a fair share of masses and wax tapers, and man, who in return hopes for divine protection. In such a world, the preaching of a pure worship, a worship "in spirit and in truth," the doctrine of grace as the sole and necessary deliverer of the soul, could hardly prove successful. No wonder then if, in 1539, the peasants of the Limousin drove away the preachers with stones and forks, as if they had been werewolves, and if, in 1572, Aluigi Contarini could write, "The people that live in the country are almost all free from that plague."

---

[1] *Bull. du Protest.*, XXI. 463–478.

[2] *Relazioni*, IV. 242.

[3] D'Avenel, *Hist. Économique de la Propriété*, . . . I. 92 *et passim*.

But let us beware of exaggeration. Did not Florimond de Raemond point out, as amongst the first heretics, "even those who had never done aught but handle the plough?" As early as 1525, when the Archbishop of Paris complains to the Parliament that there are suspects in his diocese, he mentions "a ploughman, in a village near this town." [1] At the same date we find signalized as dissenters in Thiérache "day-laborers who had gone to France as harvestmen," *i. e.*, people of the lowest grade in the rural class, people who, living merely from day to day, had not profited by the fall in the price of land, because they could not buy any, and who formed, from that time, a kind of agricultural proletariat.

In the rural portions of Normandy, for unknown reasons, "Lutheranism" had spread so much that to one district of that province was given the name of "little Germany." That district probably consisted of the environs of Rouen, the Vexin and the land of Caux, for we find after 1530 [2] heretics at Anneville, at Sotteville, at Aumale and in every town and village of the neighborhood. At about the same time, a "protégé" of Marguerite d'Angoulême, the vicar Étienne Lecourt, evangelized the peasantry of Condé-sur-Sarthe. In Saintonge, about 1534, in an absolutely rural district, in the isles of Arvert, Oléron, Ré, many congregations sprang up, composed of fishermen and vinedressers. Here, as in a few other districts, the countrymen showed their hostility against the Church by refusing to pay tithes; thus a material interest binds them to the Reformation.

---

[1] *Bull. du Protest.*, III. 28. The heretics, says he, are "gens de peu de savoir."

[2] *Bulletin*, 1887, p. 305.

In the lists given by M. Weiss for 1545–1549 we find proof of the existence of a rural Protestantism.[1] Indeed if heresy had been merely an urban growth we should find mentioned in those rolls none but centres of some importance. But we encounter names of places which were then, and in some cases have remained until now, nothing but small villages or hamlets, in Orléanais, Nivernais, Blésois, Puisaye, etc. (taking into account only the territory of the Parliament of Paris). When six heretics were discovered at Héronville near Pontoise, others at Lécourt near Langres, others at Salers, St. Martin de Valmeroux, "and other places in the mountains of Auvergne," when twenty-two men and five women are arrested in a locality so unimportant as St. Maixent in Poitou, it is hard to believe that there were no field-laborers among the victims whose occupation is not mentioned in the decrees of the court.

At the time when actual churches were organized we find many of them in villages, especially in the South. At St. Jean de Gardonnenque, in the diocese of Nîmes, the parish church is abandoned, divine service is discontinued, and the population crowds about the minister. In Agenais, where feudalism has remained more oppressive than elsewhere, the religious rising takes a form not unlike that of the "jacquerie," as in Germany.[2] In the neighborhood of Vitry in Champagne fifteen villages called for ministers from Geneva.

Besides a free and spontaneous spreading of rural heresy, another element, about 1560, becomes highly active, *i. e.*, the influence of the Protestant gentlemen-farmers. The landlord of La Ferté-Fresnel in Normandy writes to the church of Geneva, October 28, 1561:[3] "God has set me in authority over many men, and through these means one of the most superstitious districts of the realm will be gained to Christ." On his estates conversions have taken place by the hundreds, conversions by seigniorial decree. Therefore, although "this province has been the last to move," their church "is already well begun, and even bids fair to extend to fifteen or twenty leagues around." This "manorial" Protestantism spreads through "eight parishes around his castle." The success of the Reformation in the principalities of Bouillon and Montbéliard, in Béarn, and in the valleys of the Pyrenees was not unconnected with this very human element.

---

[1] *La Chambre Ardente.*

[2] Le Bourrilly in *Bull. du Protest.*, 1895, p. 597.

[3] *Bull.*, 1897, p. 461.

In any case, rural Protestantism was more important than has been commonly thought. In the midst of religious wars we find rural churches in the South, chiefly in Languedoc and the Cévennes, in Champagne, in Saintonge, etc. Till the eve of the Revolution these congregations survived. While the town craftsman had emigrated early, the countryman remained obstinately fixed to the soil. For instance, in Auvergne (where, nevertheless, the Reformation was never predominant) Protestantism, in 1685, is essentially a religion of field-laborers.[1]

Throughout France it was, until about 1560, a religion of poor folk. It was only at that date that, in the words of a young scholar,[2] "the political conduct of the Guises gave leaders to the Reformed." In order to counteract the influence of the Lorraine princes, a portion of the French nobility—the Condés, the Chastillons and their followers—rushed into political and religious opposition; the Huguenots of Faith became Huguenots of State. From that time the great Protestant stream was appropriated by the nobility. The democratic Protestantism of the towns emigrated to Holland, England and Germany, and the trades-unions fell under the sway of the religious brotherhoods, which excluded the non-Catholics and were soon to lead the revolutionary movement of the League.

If Protestantism did not completely succeed in taking root in France, the reason may be, that in the sixteenth century, owing to the social state of the time, it won more adherents among the workmen, a travelling and migratory class, than among the peasantry, which was the stable and permanent element of the nation.

H. Hauser.

---

[1] See Archives Nationales, T. T., 251, 232, 261.

[2] M. Le Bourrilly.

THE CAUSES OF CROMWELL'S WEST INDIAN EXPEDITION

SIR J. R. SEELEY, in his *Growth of British Policy*, regards the expedition against the West Indies as a mere incident unimportant in itself and in its relations and results. In his opinion Cromwell had no far-sighted plans in connection with the expedition, nor were economic considerations of more than mere secondary influence.[1] While the West Indian expedition at first glance seems of wholly minor significance, yet it is so vitally connected with the fundamental questions of Cromwell's government as to make it worth while to trace as far as possible the influences that prompted the attack on Spain, the origin of these influences, the extent of Cromwell's plans and whatever other considerations led to this expedition. In the first place, the affair was inseparably connected with his foreign policy. In the second place, it was inseparably connected with the religious movement on which Cromwell had ridden to power. In the third place, it had a vital connection with the most important economic questions of the Protectorate. Subsidiary to these were the questions: how to unite the Protestants of Europe and protect the Huguenots of France; how to prevent forever the return of the Stuarts to the English throne; and, still further in the background, how to recover England's ancient possessions in France.

At the very beginning of Cromwell's government the most important question in his foreign policy arose: Should he ally himself with France or with Spain? Cromwell never seriously intended making an alliance with Philip IV. unless driven to it as a last extremity. In spite of his turning now and then to Spain when unusually angered at France, his religious zeal and his economic hopes for England's greatness forced him back to the same point again—an attack on Spain. It is the dominant thought in his whole foreign policy.[2] He was bent on an accommodation with France, but he must first manœuvre Charles II. out of France, and establish his own position and power. He must also manœuvre France into giving a sufficient guarantee of the safety of the French Huguenots, whose welfare Cromwell had sincerely at heart. Spain was very useful in these diplomatic encounters.[1] Nor need the exorbitant and unwarrantable demands made on France cause us to think that Cromwell courted a rupture with Louis XIV. Cromwell desired an alliance with France, but Mazarin desired it more. While the negotiations were in progress Major Robert Sedgwick, under commission from Cromwell, made an unprovoked attack on Acadia and captured it. When Cromwell sent his expedition to the West Indies he instructed his commanders to capture French ships as well as Spanish. But neither of these acts produced a ripple on the stream of diplomacy.[2]

---

[1] Vol. II., pp. 73-75.

[2] Although he did once offer to come to terms with Cardenas, the Spanish ambassador, it was in a moment of anger against France and was done in such a way as to make a consummation of the bargain extremely difficult. See Gardiner, *Commonwealth and Protectorate*, II. 446.

The problem of alliance, however, had no independent importance, for the solution of it depended entirely upon other influences than the mere wish to have England in the ordinary cordial relations with the rest of Europe. It was the religious and economic questions that were driving Cromwell on and that form the key to all that intricate maze which constitutes his foreign policy. With this key for a guide, and with the remembrance that the Protector hated Charles II. and all of the Stuart family and had to establish thoroughly his own power, his vacillation in his foreign policy becomes more apparent than real. The religious motives which influenced Cromwell to undertake this expedition—the desire for the union of the Protestant states of the world and for the establishment of Protestantism and religious freedom—are well understood. The problem of Cromwell's real character and motives is, of course, a most involved one, but it can safely be said that when his ambition did not absolutely conflict with his notions on religion, he was strongly influenced by his religious inclinations. Both now urged him against Spain. There was something of the spirit of the Crusades in Cromwell's attempt to overthrow the Spanish in the West Indies. It was to his mind a blow at Anti-Christ, an extension of the true kingdom of Christ in the world. In his judgment Protestantism was still in a critical condition, especially as Puritanism was on its decline, and needed a champion who could wield the sword if necessary.[3] In addition, Cromwell's antagonism had, as was the case with many others, from the time of the anti-Spanish feeling during the reign of James, taken on a peculiar personal color, and this fact sharpened the edge of his desire to see Spain humbled.[1] The promptings, both early and late, which Cromwell had to the expedition, the whole general trend of English religious history from the time of Henry VII., the books that he must have read, the historical precedents which he would consider most sacred and binding, the precedents which he himself had established in the case of Ireland, his own deep religious life, all these influences directed him against Spain as the bulwark of the power of Rome.[2]

---

[1] See also Gardiner, II. 477–478.

[2] Thurloe, II. 583. John Leverett to Cromwell, September 5, 1654, tells of the capture of Acadia by Sedgwick in July of the same year. Mazarin was advised of it October 23, 1654, but must certainly have known it long before. However, there is no sign of protest on his part. See also Thurloe, II. 418, 419, 668.

[3] Sir J. R. Seeley conjectures that the example of Gustavus Adolphus appealed strongly to Cromwell. It is questionable whether it was not rather that of Raleigh and the Elizabethans. See *Growth of British Policy*, II. 75.

It is worth while noting that the religious ends for which the expedition was organized were fully impressed upon Cromwell's officers. After Sedgwick had been sent to Jamaica, one of the reasons he gave for not dispatching expeditions to harass the Spaniards was that the English did not have men enough to occupy the places captured "and so could not hope to effect our interests in the dispersing anything of the knowledge of the true God in Christ Jesus to the inhabitants."[3] In his instructions to Daniel Gookin, who was sent to persuade New Englanders to emigrate to Jamaica, Cromwell said: "Our desire is that this place (Jamaica), if the Lord so please, be inhabited by people who know the Lord and walk in his fear, and by their light they may enlighten the parts about them (a chief end of our undertaking and design)."[4] When Cromwell, angered at the refusal of the New England people to emigrate, vented his wrath on their agent, John Leverett, he said that in his mind one great reason why they ought to emigrate was that "that design hath its tendency to the overthrow of the man of sin."[5]

But the most powerful motives in bringing about the West Indian expedition were the economic. Cromwell's attitude toward economic questions is worthy of an examination which the limits of this article forbid. He certainly desired with his whole heart the unquestioned supremacy of England over the other nations of Europe. This he sought with unwavering persistency. England's position made it inevitable that her greatness should be commercial.

---

[1] The inconsistency between his frenzy against Spain and a leaning toward a Papist state, like France troubled Cromwell's conscience. He referred to it in his fifth speech to Parliament and explained it lamely enough. Cromwell's *Letters and Speeches*, Carlyle, Chapman and Hall ed., 1893, Part IX., p. 164.

[2] Cromwell's mind had definitely centred on Spain as the moving power antagonistic to the Reformed religion and the English state. Even the Papists in England, Scotland and Ireland he considered "Spaniolised." See Fifth Speech, Carlyle.

[3] Sedgwick to Thurloe, Thurloe, IV. 604.

[4] Instructions to Gookin, in Granville Penn's *Life of Sir Wm. Penn*, II., App. H., 585–586.

[5] Hutchinson, *Hist. Mass. Bay*, I. 190–192.

Her attitude toward the mercantile system, in relation to the great world-trade, was of vast importance. While no theorizer, Cromwell was immersed in the mercantile system of the time. The very fundamental idea of this system, begun by Richard II. and developed by Elizabeth, was that of national power. Therefore it appealed to Cromwell, who was erecting a great military state in England. The rise of nationalities and the discovery of America had hurried on the development of the mercantile system, and Cromwell came into power at its flood-tide. Since the discovery of America the world-commerce had enormously increased. The control of it brought with it national power, and all commerce and industry must be regulated with reference to England's position as compared with that of other nations. Under the mercantile system "treasure" was the best form of wealth, and the system consisted in (a) the accumulation of treasure, (b) the development of shipping and (c) the maintenance of an effective population.[1] In order to further these ends it was necessary to break through Spain's monopoly in the West Indies and gain control of Spanish America. The ablest economic writers of the time (one of whom,[2] at least, seems to have been in close relations with Cromwell), while they differed upon minor points agreed upon all the main points of the mercantile theory. Therefore, as far as Cromwell theorized at all, he drew his economic inspirations from undoubted believers in the full mercantile system. But Cromwell was a practical man, not a theorizer, and there is absolutely no sign that he could or would have worked out any original economic conceptions contrary to accepted doctrines. On the other hand, from the time when he was appointed a member of the Commission of Trade and Plantations in November 1643 until his attack on Spain, he manifested no deviation from the orthodox economic beliefs.

But although Cromwell had determined to satisfy his religious and economic desires by war if necessary, he made a first attempt to secure his wish by diplomatic action. He demanded of Spain two things. She must forego her monopoly in favor of England, give Englishmen freedom of trade in the West Indies and South America, and exempt English merchants and seamen from the operation of the Inquisition. But this in that day was like asking a nation to give up its independence. The whole life of Spain was bound up in her economic system and the absolute religious control exercised by the Inquisition. When these two demands were refused, the attack on Spain was assured.

---

[1] Cunningham, *Growth of English Industry and Commerce*, I. 426.

[2] Sir Ralph Maddison.

There was no justification for a secret attack such as Cromwell made on the West Indies. Cromwell forced Spain to war by demanding what, according to the accepted theories of the time, he knew she could not grant. She had been far from committing such depredations on English commerce as France had committed. She had been the first to recognize the new Republic. She had been willing, even anxious, to ally herself with England either for active warfare against France, or without any stipulation as to France.[1] One cannot help feeling that Cromwell was guilty of a near approach to hypocrisy in his dealings with Spain about this expedition. His offers to Spain of an alliance had never been retracted nominally, although he had made such alliance impossible by his demands in regard to the Inquisition and freedom of trade in the West Indies. Cromwell was about to act unworthily of himself and in a manner very unlike his usual open way of doing things. Every one, except those immediately engaged, was ignorant of the purpose of his preparations. Everything was carried on in the dark, and various rumors misleading to Spain were set afloat. Without declaration of war or notice of any kind a fleet was fitted out, was sent out with the utmost secrecy as to its destination,[2] fell unawares upon the colonies of a friendly nation, and finally captured one of them before the defenceless people recovered from their surprise. Although Cromwell's conscience did not trouble him in the least about making the attack, after it was made he seemed anxious to clear his government from the charges of treachery and violation of international duties. This task was committed first to Milton, Cromwell's Latin Secretary, who partly repeats the allegations set out by Cromwell in his commission to Penn, Venables and others of August 18.[3] But the outrages complained of had never before figured at all prominently, and evidently were made to do duty for the want of something better.[4] Cromwell felt strongly, as time went on, the ill repute that attached to this act of war. He therefore was impelled to make a personal defence of it in his speech before Parliament, September 17, 1656.[1] He virtually found nothing to add to what had been said in his commission and Milton's *Manifesto.* The fact is that Cromwell's party in England was a minority party. The political forces against him were powerful. A brilliant stroke that should at the same time set England at the head of the mercantile system and overthrow the Papal power in the West Indies would redound to his glory in England and overshadow in the public mind the illegality of his position.[2]

---

[1] When Cromwell became Protector, Cardenas on the part of the King of Spain congratulated him and expressed the true friendship of Spain as matters stood. But if Cromwell would take the crown, Cardenas promised that the King of Spain would venture his crown to defend him. Cardenas afterward proposed a strict alliance which should specially secure Cromwell's government and provide against the claims and title of Charles II.

[2] Even Penn and Venables were ignorant of the final destination of the enterprise until they got to Barbadoes.

[3] *Manifesto of the Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland*, etc., *put forth by the consent and advice of his Council, in which the Justice of the Cause of this Commonwealth against the Spaniards is demonstrated*, November, 1655. Masson, *Life of Milton*, V. 240–242; John Milton's *Prose Works*, Bohn; and Stowe MSS. fol. 83, cited in Gardiner, II. 475.

[4] Doubtless Cromwell and Milton, as well as the Presbyterians during the early part of the Protectorate, were disposed to assert that the death of Charles I. abrogated the treaty between Spain and England. See Cardenas to the King of Spain; Guizot, *Cromwell and the English Commonwealth*, App. 9, 404.

Whatever the reasons or justification, Cromwell determined to get hold of the West Indies, and the origin of the influences and the sources of information that impelled him to his attack on Spanish America are not far to seek. In the first place Cromwell was Elizabethan.[3] He belongs with Raleigh, Gilbert and Hakluyt. The whole aspect of the West Indian expedition is Elizabethan; either Cromwell is a unique survival of the Elizabethan spirit or else he drew his inspiration direct from Hakluyt, Raleigh and Peckham. Their hopes for the expansion of the British Empire were his; their ideas as to how to accumulate treasure from America, extend English trade and relieve the overburdened population of England were his; their religious reasons for attacking Spain in America were his; their allegations of the weakness of Spain and the cruelty of Spaniards toward the Indians were his. Indeed it seems probable that Cromwell and his advisers had been diligent readers of Hakluyt, Raleigh's *Discovery of Guiana* and Peckham's *Discoveries of Sir Humphrey Gilbert.*[4] Gage's and Modyford's memorials to Cromwell, portions of Milton's *Manifesto* of 1655, and Cromwell's Fifth Speech are in large part restatements of Hakluyt's *Discourse on Planting*, or of Raleigh or Peckham.

It is entirely possible that the connecting link between the Elizabethans and Cromwell was *The English-American, or A New Survey of the West Indies*, by Thomas Gage, published in 1648. Gage had an eventful history, and was no doubt the best-informed man in England on Spanish America.[1] His book created a sensation and was widely read.[2] The Dedicatory Epistle is addressed to Fairfax, whom he tries to spur on to undertake the conquest of America. Gage was undoubtedly familiar with most writers on the New World, although he says in his dedication that no one had written upon America for a hundred years. This statement proves Gage to be not over-scrupulous, for he mentions no authority, except Las Casas, to whom the hundred years would apply. He copied parts of his *English-American* word for word from Thomas Nicholas's *Conquest of the West Indies*, which was in turn, as he must have known, a translation of Gomara. Not only so, but it is altogether probable that he was acquainted with the accounts of Mexico and the West Indies published in Purchas.[3] Parts of Gage's Dedicatory Epistle are very likely Hakluyt and Raleigh; and if he would take bodily from Nicholas's translation he would do the same by Raleigh and Hakluyt.

---

[1] He says: "With this King and State (Spain) I say, you are at present in hostility. We put you into this hostility . . . For we are ready to excuse this and most of our actions, and to justify them too, as well as excuse them," etc.

[2] Seeley in his *British Policy* confirms this, II. 99.

[3] This is true only in a general sense. He partook of the spirit of the Elizabethan age as shown by others than Elizabeth. For personally Elizabeth and Cromwell are opposites. The first represents England at rest; the second England in motion.

[4] See especially Hakluyt's *Discourse on Western Planting*, *Maine Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 2nd Ser., Vol. II.; Raleigh's *Discovery of Guiana* in his *History of the World*, Vol. VI., edition of 1820, together with *Considerations on the Voyage to Guiana* in the same volume; and *A True Report of the late Discoveries*, etc., *by Sir Humphrey Gilbert*, by Sir Geo. Peckham, Hakluyt's *Voyages*, III. 308.

---

[1] Gage came from Surrey, was educated as a Jesuit priest in Spain, but joined the order of St. Dominic. He was selected as a missionary to Spanish America and was smuggled into the colonies. He lived in Spanish America twelve years, mostly in Mexico and Central America. He returned to Spain, then to England, and renounced his religion about 1641. His work, *The English-American*, was the first adequate description of this whole vast and unknown region. Gage joined the side of Parliament and thus commended himself to Cromwell. See *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*

[2] Parts of the *English-American* were done into French and German, and later into Spanish.

[3] Southey in his edition of *Madoc* with notes, London, 1805, p. 468, refers to this, but describes Nicholas's *The Pleasant Historie of the Conquest of the West India*, etc., as translated from Bernal Diaz, instead of Gomara. Nicholas's translation was published in 1596. It was republished in Purchas, III., Book IV., chapter 9, ed. 1617. Gage copied his account of Cortez in many places word for word from Nicholas and not from Purchas. In his account of Mexico he may have followed Purchas's adaptation of Nicholas. He used the same ideas and often the same words and phrases, only changing the order of sentences and paragraphs. At any rate it is hardly conceivable that he should not have known of the account of Mexico in Purchas. If so he could not have failed to notice the account immediately preceding Nicholas's translation in Purchas, called *History of the Mexican Nation described in Pictures*, and the connection of Hakluyt, Raleigh and Spellman with it. Purchas was a writer well known in New England even, and these accounts of America are there commented on. See Rev. John Higginson to Rev. Thomas Thatcher, *Conn. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, III. 318. The fourth volume of Purchas contains among others a translation of Las Casas copied from the translation of 1583. See further *The Pleasant Historie of the Conquest of the West India, now called New Spaine*, etc., translated out of the Spanish tongue by T. N., 1578, London, 1596. The attention of the world seems to have been drawn about this time to Spanish America and Spain's treatment of the Indians. Las Casas had been translated into Dutch, Flemish, Latin, German and English (Winsor, II. 341). In 1655 was published *America; or an exact Description of the West Indies*, etc., by N. N., Gent., London; also a second edition of Gage's *English-American*. In 1656 appeared *The Tears of the Indians*, etc., by John Phillips (a nephew of Milton), a translation of Las Casas. The article on Phillips and his relations to Milton and Cromwell in the *Dict. of Nat. Biog.* is misleading. In 1699 Gage's book was translated into Spanish.

Thomas Challoner wrote the metrical dedication of Gage's book, which shows acquaintance with the writings of Purchas, Hakluyt, Ramusio and Raleigh.[1] It is very improbable that Gage, who was so much associated with Challoner, should not also have been acquainted with these authors as well as with Las Casas and Gomara.[2] The whole book is an attempt to arouse Englishmen against Spain and "Rome's Idolatry" and to show how valuable these provinces would be to England because of trade and of mines and bullion.

But Fairfax soon ceased to be the most pronounced leader of the revolution in England and Cromwell took his place. Gage then transferred his urgings to Cromwell, and six years later sent as a memorial to the Protector simply a résumé of his *English-American*.[3] In it he skilfully brings forward what would most appeal to Cromwell through his economic and religious notions. He draws a tempting picture of the prospective trade of ginger, hides, sugar, wheat, wines, and bullion from the mines of Mexico and Peru. He is careful to mention the fact that "the power of Austria (Rome's chief strength and pillar) is in the American mines." He shows that the sparse population of this vast territory would make it an easy matter to expel the Spaniards; that the Indians could offer no opposition because not allowed to carry arms; that the interior towns also had no walls or guns. This memorial is put down in Thurloe's *State Papers* as belonging to December, 1654. But it bears internal evidence of having been written before December. There are indications that it was sent at Cromwell's request or at the request of some one for him.[4] There seems to be no reasonable doubt that Gage had great influence in determining Cromwell's mind as to the expedition.[5] If so, it is impossible that the memorial should have been sent as late as December, when all of Cromwell's plans were matured, and it certainly contemplates preparations to be made, not preparations already completed. There is no sign in it that Gage had been appointed chaplain to Venables or knew that he was to have a place in the expedition,[1] and Gage says, "Nothing can be acted upon the mainland until October."[2]

---

[1] "Reader, behold presented to thine eye,
What us Columbus off'red long agoe,
Of this New-World a new discoverie,
Which here our author doth so clearly show;
That he the state which of these parts would know
Need not hereafter search the plenteous store
Of Hakluyt, Purchas and Ramusio," etc.

Again:
"Renowned Rawleigh, ...
And thereof writ both what he saw and knew."

[2] Gage was acquainted with the history of early discovery and speaks in his Dedicatory Epistle of Columbus at the Court of Henry VII. In his memorial to Cromwell he likens himself to Columbus.

[3] Thurloe, III. 59.

[4] Gage had some communication with the government previous to the date of this memorial. On August 20, 1653, he sent a certificate in behalf of the widow of a pilot, one of his flock. Very likely he was asked to do so because of his standing with Cromwell. *State Papers Domestic*, 1653-4, p. 482.

[5] Ludlow in his *Memoirs*, I. 417, says that Gage "was reported to have been a princi-

In this connection it is necessary to consider a like memorial by Thomas Modyford, governor of Barbadoes. He was consulted because of his experience in that part of the world and because he had performed valuable service for the Commonwealth party in the struggle between Ayscue and Lord Willoughby over Barbadoes.[3] He advised the selection of Guiana, on the South American coast, and corroborated Gage in many particulars, especially as to the comparative ease with which Spanish America could be conquered. If any island was taken he advised Cuba.[4] This document, too, is put down in Thurloe as belonging to December 1654. It certainly was written in answer to a request for Modyford's opinion and advice, which surely would not have been asked after all preparations were made.[5] Both these memorials ought to be referred to the time before August 18th, when Cromwell issued his commission to Penn, Venables and others. They belong, with Cooper's letter to Thurloe, Mazarin's letter to Cromwell and the influence of John Cotton and Roger Williams in the matter, to the same general period previous to August 1654, and represent the season when

---

pal adviser of this undertaking." That this was true was the popular impression in Bishop Burnet's time. (See *Hist.*, I. 49.) He says in substance that while Cromwell was balancing in his mind this project, "Gage . . . came over from the West Indies" and influenced the Protector by his accounts of the wealth of the Spaniards and the feebleness of Spanish America. This illustrates Burnet's inaccuracy, for Gage returned to England seventeen years before Cromwell undertook this expedition. See also Long, *Hist. of Jamaica*, I. 221.

[1] On December 20 the Council registered an order for a ship to convey Gage to the fleet at Portsmouth. While the date is December 20, it is noted in the entry that he had already gone, and also that the warrant was issued on a previous order of the Protector. It is therefore altogether probable that he was appointed chaplain a considerable time before. Gage's words about himself as "one who waits for the conversion of the poor Indians," lead one to think that his motive in sending the memorial was that he might receive some such appointment.

[2] He also hopes that Cromwell's faith may *yet* be active abroad as well as at home, and that he may become the protector of the Indians as of England.

[3] *Cavaliers and Roundheads, 1650–2*, by N. Darnell Davis, p. 209.

[4] Long in his *History of Jamaica* accuses Modyford of advising Guiana instead of the islands for selfish reasons, on the ground that adding to the English sugar-producing islands would increase the supply and lower the profits. Modyford's reasons, however, given in his memorial, are perfectly sound and convincing.

[5] It advises Cromwell to *land* in Barbadoes in November, if he can. Modyford would hardly have written such advice if there had been a possibility that it would not reach Cromwell until December.

Cromwell was balancing in his mind the question of an attack upon Spain.

The origin of the more theoretical economic influences ought not to be overlooked. Among the ablest economic writers of that age are Mun, Malynes and Maddison, all of whom lived in Cromwell's time and all of whom preached at bottom the same doctrines as to the mercantile system.[1] Sir Ralph Maddison seems to have been the economic authority of the Protector and his *Great Britain's Remembrancer*, based upon Malynes's *Lex Mercatoria*, was addressed or dedicated to Cromwell.[2]

Evidently Cromwell, before he had ratified the peace with the Dutch,[3] but when he felt assured that the war was at an end, had been looking into the matter of the West Indies. He, or some one for him, applied to one William Cooper for suitable persons to act as guides in the waters adjoining Spanish America. He was anxious for information as to ports, and the latitude and longitude of islands in the Gulf of Mexico. Cooper in reply to the application furnished Thurloe a book in Dutch setting out the desired information, which was not to be had in English. In answer to Cromwell's request for information, he says: "How far this may contribute, I submit to you (Thurloe) and others." That the plans of Cromwell were somewhat mature and were known to Cooper appears from the fact that Cooper advises him, in the choice of captains and others, to be sure to choose as many as possible who have become accustomed to the heat of that climate. He even goes so far as to recommend two persons for responsible positions. Evidently he had talked with Thurloe or Cromwell before about this, or some other matter connected with it, for he mentions having given former notice about Powell, whom he now recommends. He also intimates that he will have further information.[4]

Cardinal Mazarin's powerful hand is also seen in this expedition. With that crafty insinuation which he knew how to use with deadly effect, we find him in nearly every letter through Bordeaux and De Baas holding up the bait of the West Indies before Cromwell. In a letter to his ministers, March 25, 1654, he made the first advances in a roundabout reference to a foreign war.[1] Two days later he openly urged the Protector to a war in which he could not only get Dunkirk, but make as much progress as he wished in the Indies,[2] and on May 8th he added another inducement which weighed heavily with one committed to the mercantile system. He urged Cromwell, while he had a large fleet afloat,[3] to employ it against the West Indies, which he said were in poor condition. He also furnished Cromwell with information, received from various sources in Spain, as to when the galleons would arrive at Cadiz, and urged their capture.[4] Only twelve days later, in order to keep the Protector's mind occupied with the thought, he bade De Baas again approach Cromwell.[5] Then he advanced a step further and offered to assist England in the capture of the two Indian fleets having on board six millions in gold. He would either join Cromwell in the business, or if the Protector wished to conceal his share in the matter, it could be done as he desired, and his share of the profits be faithfully guarded.[6] Cromwell was perfectly willing to receive all of Mazarin's suggestions and valuable information, but he did not intend that France should have any claims upon the Indies, and all such offers were refused.

---

[1] Mun was an advocate of the mercantilist theory as to bullion, while Malynes was a bullionist. They both, however, had the same end in view. See Cunningham, *Growth of English Industry*, etc., and Palgrave, *Dict. of Polit. Econ.*; also Malynes's *Lex Mercatoria*.

[2] Edward Misselden ought also to be mentioned. He seems to have had no influence with Cromwell, having been a supporter of Laud and the King. Nevertheless, he afterward offered his services to Cromwell (December 1654), apparently without success. Thurloe, III. 13.

[3] Ratified by Cromwell, April 19, 1654; proclaimed April 26th of same year.

[4] Thurloe, II. 250, April 26, 1654.

Mazarin's hint that England could have without molestation all of the Spanish Indies that she could conquer, was strengthened by Cromwell's knowledge of the weakness of the Spanish colonies. The mercantile and colonial systems which Spain considered her great prop were having a disastrous effect upon her colonies.[7] While the laws enacted by the Council of India were in the main enlightened and remarkably careful of the rights and privileges of the natives, the actual government in Spanish America was exceedingly oppressive. Under the system of personal service, and the method of apportioning natives to compulsory labor, the population had rapidly declined and with it the strength of the colonies.[8]

It is interesting and important to notice the connection of New

---

[1] *Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France*, Mazarin, VI. 134. These letters constitute a strong proof that Cromwell early in 1654 had definite intentions against the West Indies. Mazarin with the subtle skill of which he was master had gained in some manner an inkling of the truth.

[2] *Id.*, p. 139.

[3] Referring to the capture of French vessels by an English fleet off St. Malo.

[4] *Documents Inédits*, etc., Mazarin, VI. 157.

[5] *Id.*, VI. 163.

[6] *Id.*, VI. 171.

[7] See *Historia de la Economia Politica en España*, por Don Manuel Colmeiro, II. Capitulo LXXVIII., Sistema Colonial.

[8] See *Recopilacion de Leyes de las Indias*, edited by Boix, for Acts of Council of India, whose remedial legislation is the strongest possible proof of the extreme cruelty in the actual administration of affairs in Spanish America.

England with the West Indian expedition and the influence which New Englanders had in helping Cromwell to make up his mind in regard to it. Cromwell kept up some correspondence with William Hooke, then pastor in New Haven, Conn., who was a confidant of the Protector and related to him by marriage. A message to John Cotton through Hooke brought on a correspondence between Cotton and Cromwell. Cotton took occasion to urge the religious necessity of driving the Spaniards from America. As we shall see this seems to have, perhaps first, set the matter definitely before Cromwell's mind.[1] Cotton wrote to Cromwell July 28, 1651, and Cromwell answered about a month after the battle of Worcester.[2] It was some time during this correspondence and before the last of 1652 that Cotton urged Cromwell to "dry up Euphrates."[3] So much of the correspondence as is extant would indicate that Cotton exercised some influence over Cromwell. Therefore, when the latter became Protector, the idea of his religious duty as to Spain was by no means new to him.

But there was a nearer American influence to Cromwell than John Cotton, far away in New England. Roger Williams went to England in November of 1651 and remained until 1654. Williams was strongly drawn towards Oliver, whom he called a second Cromwell raised up to champion religious liberty, and evidently the feeling was fully reciprocated.[4] While in England he was in peculiarly close relationship with the Protector, and in his letter to the General Court of Massachusetts Bay, October 5, 1654, speaks of his many "private discourses" with "divers of the chief of our nation, and especially his Highness."[5] To Williams, Cromwell disclosed his most secret religious thoughts and fears, which throw a strong light on what was driving him against Spain.[6] So far did Williams's knowledge extend that he could say positively, "I know the Protector had strong thoughts of Hispaniola and Cuba."[1] His positive knowledge of Cromwell's intentions and finally of his plans was gained months before the commission of August 18th, and beyond any doubt was the result of discussion covering all the time since his arrival in England.[2]

---

[1] See *Diary of Samuel Sewall, Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 5th Ser., V. 436–437 and quotations made hereafter.

[2] October 2, 1651. See *Coll. of Original Papers of Mass. Bay Colony*, Hutchinson, p. 233, for Cotton's letter; and Cromwell's *Letters and Speeches*, Carlyle, Part VII., p. 308, for Cromwell's. Cromwell's letter is in the Lenox Library, New York City.

[3] Cotton died December 23, 1652. There is nothing in Cotton's letter about this expedition nor in Cromwell's answer. The character of both letters would indicate that it was between the time of the battle of Worcester and December 1652, and while Roger Williams was in England, that Cotton urged upon Cromwell a blow at Spain. Williams and others refer to Cotton's part in the matter as too well known to require explanation.

[4] *Narragansett Club Publications*, VI. 193.

[5] *Id.*, p. 270.

[6] "The late renowned Oliver confessed to me, in close discourse about the Protestants' affairs, etc., that he yet feared great persecutions to the Protestants from the Romanists, before the downfall of the Papacy." Roger Williams to John Winthrop, Jr., February 6, 1660, in *Narragansett Club Publications*, VI. 307.

John Winthrop, Jr., who had already heard something about the expedition,[3] applied to Williams for information. Williams replied under date of December 15, 1654, in the letter in which he referred to the Protector's intentions as to Hispaniola and Cuba. He adds: "Mr. Cotton's interpreting of Euphrates to mean the West Indies,[4] the supply of gold (to take of taxes) and the provision of a warmer Diverticulum and Receptaculum than New England is, will make a footing into those parts very precious."[5]

There is a very interesting letter by Rev. John Higginson, of Guilford, Conn., to Rev. Thomas Thacher of Weymouth, Mass., written October 25, 1654. He speaks of the destitution in New England and says that many were inclined to remove to Ireland, which Cromwell had tried before to colonize with New England people. He says further that Cromwell had signified his intention of doing what he could for the people of New England, whose condition he was sensible of; that if they would remove he might give them the opportunity where they should have towns, habitations and staple commodities. Higginson then conjectures the place to be Hispaniola or Mexico. He goes on: "A great fleet was prepared to be sent thitherward, and its thought that it was to drive out the Spaniard, which if it be effected there may be room enough for all New England people and many more, ... Having constant intelligence from some nearly related to me, who are also nearly related to the Lord Protector,[6] we of Guilford are as like to share in any privileges there as any other . . . . Its thought by some that the design for the West Indies may be the means to dry up Euphrates, viz., the stream of supportments that makes glad the city of Rome, etc."[7] The correspondence which Higginson refers to, in which

---

[1] *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 4th Ser., VI. 286, quoted hereafter.

[2] Williams wrote John Winthrop, Jr., July 12, 1654. It was his first letter after his return to America. If his passage took a month or six weeks his positive knowledge of Cromwell's intentions must have been gained at least before June 1, 1654. This letter to Winthrop contains nothing about the West Indian expedition, Williams evidently considering it a secret until the time set for its departure.

[3] *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 3rd Ser., X. 1.

[4] How did Williams know of Cotton's interpretation except through Cromwell?

[5] *Id.*, 4th Ser., VI. 286.

[6] Samuel Desbrow, brother of John Desbrow, brother-in-law of Cromwell; see Bernard C. Steiner's *History of Guilford and Madison, Conn.*, pp. 41, 65, 67.

[7] *Conn. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, III. 318; *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 5th Ser., V. 437. See also Prince, *History of New England;* and Steiner's *History of Guilford*, p. 74.

Cromwell had signified his intention of doing what he could for the people of New England, went back to March 5, 1654, and earlier. The place of relief which Cromwell had so early in mind, Higginson (and probably Governor Leete of Guilford) understood, no doubt with the best of reason, to be Hispaniola or Mexico. For the Protector had notified New England people, undoubtedly through Samuel Desbrow in the correspondence about March 1654, that the project of their removal to Ireland was at an end.[1]

There is a passage in the diary of Samuel Sewall, dated November 10, 1696, which supplies a curious confirmation of many facts as to this West Indian expedition, although written nearly forty years after Cromwell's death. It helps also to make plain the influence which New England men had in determining the Protector's mind to an attack on Spain. Sewall mentions a ride to Salem. He went to visit Governor Bradstreet, "who," he says, "confirms what had formerly (been) told me about Mr. Gage his being in the expedition against Hispaniola and dying in it."[2] November 11: "In the even visited Major Brown, there sung First part of 72 Ps. and last part of 24th. But first visited Mr. Higginson, though [he] had din'd with us. He tells me that the Protector, Oliver Cromwell, when Gen^l^ wrot to Mr. Hook of Newhaven, and therein sen comendations to Mr. Cotton; upon which Mr. Cotton was writt to by Mr. Hook and desir'd to write the Gen^l^, which He did, and advis'd him that to take from the Spaniard in America would be to dry up Euphrates; which was one thing put Him upon this Expedition to Hispaniola, and Mr. Higginson[3] and 3 more were to have gone to Hispaniola if the Place had been taken. O. Cromwell would have had Capt. Leverett to have gone thether Gov^r^, told him was drying up Euphrates, and He intended not to desist till He came to the Gates of Rome. This Mr. Cooke said he had heard his father Leverett tell many a time. Gov^r^ Leverett said My Lord let us make an end of one voyage first and declin'd it; at which Oliver was blank."[4]

Williams, Cotton, Hooke and Higginson all had unusual opportunities of discussing with Cromwell such an undertaking, or else had unusual opportunities of knowing whether the idea had been fixed early in the Protector's mind. Thus before the seductive influences of Mazarin had turned Cromwell's eyes toward the West

---

[1] Steiner, *History of Guilford and Madison, Conn.*, p. 67; *Conn. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, III. 318. "Many have inclined to Ireland, but that is now at an end; the L. Prot. hath sent word that it is wholly disposed of."

[2] He died in Jamaica in 1656.

[3] This is the same John Higginson as the writer of the previous letter.

[4] *Diary of Samuel Sewall, Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 5th Ser., V. 436–7.

Indies, John Cotton and Roger Williams, at least, had discussed with him this blow at the chief support of the Church of Rome.[1]

It is important also to notice how far Cromwell's plans extended. He had no idea of the world-wide expansion of the British Empire in the modern sense, *i. e.*, of a union of colonies on an equal footing with the mother country. But, nevertheless, he did have a well-grounded idea, though somewhat undefined, of a widely extended British Empire, and his schemes of conquest were far-reaching. The events connected with this expedition when taken together bring out not only a policy, well considered and tenaciously held to, of setting England at the head of the navigation and mercantile system and at the head of all opposition to the Church of Rome, but also the profound calculation of Cromwell looking to the extension of the colonial system of England. St. Domingo was by no means the end of his designs. He saw in imagination England as the centre of a great naval empire. In this he anticipated the future and was the forerunner of modern English governmental policy. After St. Domingo was taken, according to Cromwell's profound scheme, England was gradually to absorb the rest of the Spanish possessions in America. This was the meaning of his talks with Roger Williams and Thomas Gage. This was in the direct line of the religious impulse that so strongly urged him against Spain. To this the economic influences that controlled Cromwell inevitably pointed. His designs took in the mainland of South America, and he already saw in imagination Guiana and the country between the Orinoco and Porto Bello in his possession. He had asked Cooper for information about all of the Gulf of Mexico from the Bahamas, and what course to steer from place to place, and Cooper recommended Captain Shelley because he knew most of the American coasts and had been south beyond the Rio de la Plata. He recommended Captain Powell because he had been in the Mexican Gulf "from top to bottom."[2]

A reference to the instructions given by Cromwell to the heads of the expedition discloses at once the very thorough manner in which the whole affair had been discussed and how fully developed were the plans. The commanders were directed first to gain an interest in that part of the West Indies which was in the possession of the Spaniard. Three methods of attack had been discussed by the Protector and were brought to the attention of Penn and Venables. The first was to land on some of the islands, particularly Hispaniola and St. John's Island, one or both.[1] Or, second, the expedition might make for the mainland anywhere between the Orinoco and Porto Bello, aiming principally at Carthagena.[2] Or, third, the two former methods could be combined so as to allow an attack on St. Domingo, or Porto Bello and afterward Carthagena.[3] Modyford urged upon Cromwell the opportunities of taking Trinidad, and the country about the Orinoco, Venezuela and so on around to Carthagena. Gage discloses even more extensive plans of conquest and the influence of the plans of both Gage and Modyford is easily discernible in Cromwell's matured instructions. Gage brought before the Protector the picture of the conquest of Cuba, Honduras, Hispaniola, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama, Trinidad, Yucatan and, as a final step, Mexico and Peru. He expressed the hope of seeing him in full sway in Spanish America as he was in England. He clearly understood and described how weak Spain was. All Indians were, he said, deprived of arms, as were negroes and mulattoes, whether bond or free. In this he was correct.[4] He was right, too, in saying that if the freedom of the slaves were proclaimed they could be depended upon to join the English.[5] From the very beginning of the expedition General Penn had gone on the principle of extending British sovereignty over all possible portions of the Spanish domain. Almost the very day he captured Jamaica, in May 1655, he sent the *Martin* from Jamaica along the Spanish Main to Carthagena and the *Grantham* to Trinidad. Vice-Admiral Goodson, his successor, made attempts on Carthagena and Santiago de Cuba, was constantly on the lookout for further conquest and discussed the capture of Havana. Sedgwick, when virtually governor of Jamaica, also discussed with Cromwell the taking of Havana and Carthagena, and recommended getting the country

---

[1] We are obliged to believe that Williams felt that there were good and sufficient grounds for an attack on Spain, and that considerations other than the religious warranted it, because of his strong stand against propagating the Gospel by the sword. See his letter to Endicott in which he says that no man can maintain his Christ by the sword and maintain a true Christ. *Narragansett Club Publications*, IV. 502.

[2] Thurloe, II. 250.

---

[1] This conformed to Gage's plan. It is to be noted that Mr. J. W. Fortescue in his article on this expedition printed in *Macmillan's Magazine*, LXIX. 184, says that Gage favored an attack on the mainland and Modyford on Cuba and Hispaniola. Gage is the one who very especially urged Hispaniola and Modyford the mainland about the Orinoco. See Thurloe, III. 59–63.

[2] This was in the main Modyford's plan.

[3] Extract from instructions to Gen. Robert Venables, taken from Burchett, pp. 385–6. Cromwell says in these instructions that he communicates "what hath been under our consideration."

[4] *Recopilacion de Leyes de las Indias*, II. 320, Ordinances XV., XVI., XVII., XVIII.

[5] The ordinances in the *Recopilacion de Leyes de las Indias* in regard to mulattoes, negroes, etc., show that runaway slaves were numerous, that they were very ill-disposed toward the Spaniards and gave them much trouble. Modyford, also, advised arming the Indians about the Orinoco when they should be won over.

"down Ryo de Hatch and so to Santa Martha."[1] Among the Spanish prisoners brought by Penn's fleet to England was a native of the Canaries, with whom Cardenas, the Spanish ambassador, at once communicated. While a prisoner at Jamaica he had heard it said by English officers that among the plans they were to put into execution was the capture of St. Augustine, in Florida. Cardenas was sufficiently impressed with the correctness of the information to communicate it at once to his government.[2] In October 1655, Cromwell wrote to the following effect: "And it is much designed among us to strive with the Spaniard for the mastery of all those seas," etc.[3] Nor should we lose sight of Sedgwick's capture of Acadia, although an attack on French territory, in the summer of 1654.

The advisers of Charles II. understood how far-reaching were Cromwell's plans in regard to conquest and colonization and perceived the real motives of his attack on the West Indies. "A.B." in writing to the King of Spain, January 1656, in behalf of Charles, lays great stress on the fact that Cromwell intended to colonize the West Indies and by his fleet cut off the Spanish trade.[4] In fact on other grounds the entire expedition has no meaning. To suppose that after such enormous preparations and expense the Protector would be content with a few square miles of territory falls hardly short of absurd.

Notwithstanding the suggestions he received, this was in a peculiar sense Cromwell's own design. In originating and developing it he acted with practically unlimited authority. He took this momentous step alone. He had no parliamentary sanction for it, and many of the influential members of his Council were opposed to it. Nevertheless he persevered as a king might have done, for he was a king in fact. He ran counter to what, on the surface, seemed for England's advantage. He was opposed by the trading class, who looked only to the immediate effect on commerce of such a move. It meant a rupture with Spain, and great numbers of vessels and great quantities of English goods would be liable to seizure. It meant sudden ruin to merchants whose support of the government was necessary, and whose ships and goods would be confiscated.

---

[1] Sedgwick to Thurloe, January 24, 1655-6. Thurloe, IV. 454. This would include a considerable part of the western coast of South America.

[2] Cardenas to King of Spain, October 4, 1655. Guizot, *Cromwell and the English Commonwealth*, II., App., p. 447.

[3] Cited from *The Expedition to the West Indies, 1655*, by J. W. Fortescue, *Macmillan's Magazine*, LXIX. 184, March, 1894. Note in this connection the diary of Samuel Sewall, in which Cromwell is said to have told Leverett that he did not intend to desist until he came to the gates of Rome.

[4] British Historical Manuscripts Commission, Portland MSS., I. 679.

It meant perhaps a fatal reaction against the Protector himself. It was a critical point in Cromwell's career. The trade and manufacturing interests are powerful interests for any one to oppose. But like the great man he was, he was looking not at immediate risks alone, but at ultimate effects as well. Cromwell could not turn back; to give way and abandon his West Indian plan would have given such a shock to his reputation as to endanger his position. Through it all he kept a well-balanced judgment and a confident, resolute manner. He redoubled his efforts. He appealed to the political and religious prejudices of the people. He silenced if he did not convince the merchants and manufacturers, who are ever prone to favor those policies which will yield immediate rather than ultimate commercial advantages. Cromwell stood on the threshold of a new age. He belonged both to the past and to the future. He represents a curious blending of religious zeal and modern commercial spirit, eager, unrelenting, never-tiring. Religious interests as the basis of political action were passing away and in their place were coming the commercial interests of a new age. The bonds of religious unity were not the forces that in the new era could bind states together. The growth of national feeling, of independence and political unity, had forever supplanted them. Therefore any hope of uniting the Protestant states was futile. Nor could he hope to propagate Protestantism by the sword. The West Indian expedition was in some sense epochal. It opened a new era for England. It began the policy of the true expansion of the British Empire. It determined the economic policy, not only of the Protectorate, but of the Restoration. It determined England's relation to, and laid the foundation for her supremacy in, the mercantile and colonial system until the last years of the eighteenth century.

FRANK STRONG.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY OF THE BRITISH DEPENDENCIES IN THE FURTHER EAST

THE striking diversity of Great Britain's administration of her various dependencies in the Malay Peninsula and around the China Sea is due to the history of their establishment and growth. Thrown in comparatively close proximity, can be seen four distinct methods of governing Asiatic possessions. There exist almost side by side: (1) the Straits Settlements, exhibiting the system characteristic of the government of India, that of holding certain strategic points under direct British administration, while controlling, as a dependent protectorate, a number of states, whose native rulers are guided in their internal government by British officers; (2) the state of Saráwak, of which the labor and the profits of government belong to an individual, who possesses the attributes of sovereignty, but yet is a British subject and under the protection of the British government; (3) the territories of the British North Borneo Company, the first created of the new governing companies founded on the lines of the old East India Company, rendering profits to stockholders but under elaborate charter restrictions; and (4) the island of Hong Kong, which is from its geographical conditions unable to expand over adjoining territory, and is held for commercial and military reasons under the direct administration of the British Colonial Office.

In all these four dependencies local conditions have influenced administrative development, but in their history, even more than in their local conditions, can be traced the different causes which have led to the difference of their administrative expedients. Though the problems their administrators have to face are somewhat different there are yet certain characteristics common to them all. In each the problem of the Chinaman is present. The commercial gifts of that most commercial of races have placed the business interests of all four dependencies in Chinese hands, while the political difficulty of effectively managing the members of the race most alien to European ideas needs the most careful handling. In three of the four dependencies the Malays complicate the difficulty of handling the Chinese, for the *Pax Britannica* prevents the Malays from murdering their astute commercial oppressors and the government is therefore forced to take measures for their protection.

It is not proposed in this article to deal with the actual condition of the four British dependencies in the Further East or to describe in detail the existing systems of administration. Such information can be easily obtained from the different Blue Books and official reports, of which summaries can be found in such easily accessible works of reference as the *Colonial Office List* and the *Statesman's Year-book*. A brief account of their history and geography can be read in the excellent *Historical Geography of the British Colonies* by C. P. Lucas.[1] It is intended rather to deal with the administrative evolution of the four dependencies, pointing out the salient points of their history and thus illustrating the complexity of the colonial administration of the British Empire.

When the hundred years of the Portuguese monopoly of the Asiatic trade with Europe came to an end with the appearance of the Dutch in 1596 and of the English in 1600 in Asiatic seas, the merchants of the two great Protestant trading nations made first for the Spice Islands. It was the peppers and the spices of the Further East that promised the largest profit; and the first factories, as the establishments were called where stocks of the desired commodities were collected for conveyance to Europe by the annual fleets, were founded by both the Dutch and the English in the islands of Java and Sumatra. The rivalry between the Dutch and the English merchants was extreme, and the massacre at Amboyna in February 1623 roused the wrath of the whole English nation. As the seventeenth century proceeded the rival nations gradually separated their areas of Asiatic trade. The Dutch East India Company devoted itself mainly to the importation of peppers and spices, and for this reason concentrated its energies upon the Spice Islands, Ceylon and the Malabar coast of India, while the London East India Company, without surrendering its desire to compete in this lucrative business, fixed its attention rather upon India, and fostered its trade with Surat and Bengal and, after its foundation in 1639, with Madras. Towards the close of the seventeenth century, when English power in Europe was increasing while that of the Dutch was waning, the affairs of the London East India Company were vigorously managed by a great statesman. Sir Josiah Child, whose imperial ideas foreshadowed a century before their time the great events which were to make the English masters of India, resolved to press the claims of his Company to a larger share of the trade of the Further East. He was unable, indeed, to recover Bantam in

---

[1] Vol. I.; Oxford, 1888.

Java (which had for a time been the London East India Company's chief spice and pepper factory), owing to the intrigues of the Dutch, but the expedition sent for that purpose in 1684 founded a factory at Bencoolen in Sumatra, protected by Fort Marlborough, which became eventually the nucleus of the East India Company's establishments in the Further East. He made vigorous efforts to open up a profitable trade with China and Japan, but there likewise the Dutch were before him and a long time was to elapse before the English traded on an equality with the Dutch in those distant seas. Batavia, the capital of the Dutch Indies, was better placed than Calcutta or Madras to control the trade to the Further East; and the English writers in the beginning of the eighteenth century describe in bitter terms the relentless opposition of the Dutch to all their efforts to establish themselves in their rival's sphere of influence. It was true that the Dutch and the English were allies in Europe and fought side by side against France in the War of the Spanish Succession; but at that very time appeared Hall's *History of the Barbarous Cruelties and Massacres committed by the Dutch in the East Indies*, a little book which had a wide circulation and exerted considerable influence at the time of its publication in 1712. The English free merchants or "interlopers," as they were officially termed, made great inroads on the monopoly of the Dutch trade in the Further East, as well as on that of the chartered English merchants, as can be seen from the pages of that most entertaining of interloping sea-captains, Alexander Hamilton, whose *New Account of the East Indies*, published in 1727, is full of narratives of his successfully outwitting both Dutch and English officials. During the first half of the eighteenth century, the interlopers carried on the brunt of the fight with the Dutch, while the East India Company's station at Bencoolen was harassed from Batavia and prevented from making adequate returns for the capital expended for its maintenance. But the middle era of the century witnessed a change in the situation. The triumphs of the English in India reacted upon their position in the Further East. Clive's daring in facing responsibility, and the victory of Forde over the Dutch expedition sent into Bengal in 1759, definitely assured the predominance of the English in the Further East as well as in India, and when Warren Hastings came to the helm of the East India Company's affairs in India, a fresh effort was made to use the recognized power and prestige of the Company's government to expand the volume of English trade in the Malay Peninsula, in the Spice Islands and in China seas.

It would be tedious to narrate in detail the various early attempts made by the East India Company to secure what it considered its fair share of the trade of the Spice Islands during the seventeenth century. The only accurate statement of these efforts is to be found in a publication by the India Office, which is in the form of an official report and does not pretend to be an historical narrative. Nevertheless Mr. F. C. Danvers has compiled a work of the greatest historic value, in his *Report to the Secretary of State for India in Council on the Records of the India Office: Records relating to Agencies, Factories, and Settlements not now under the Administration of the Government of India*, published in 1888. Mr. Danvers in this report has given a classified list of all the documents touching his subject preserved in the India Office, with a brief summary of the information they contain, so that it is now possible for any student who desires to trace the history of the East India Company in Java, Sumatra, Borneo, Cochin China, China or Japan to find out exactly what assistance he can obtain from the papers preserved at the India Office. Mr. Danvers indicates in his summaries the difficulties under which the factory at Bencoolen suffered from the enmity of the Dutch, the various unsuccessful attempts made by the Company to form settlements in the island of Borneo, and the methods pursued in prosecuting trade with China and Japan. The curious practice of confiding the charge of the China trade to the care of the "supracargoes" of the different ships sent in the annual fleet to Canton, who were to meet in committee and live at the Company's expense while purchasing Chinese commodities for the European market, out of which grew the China establishment of the East India Company, is outlined as well as the various attempts to obtain admittance to other ports than Canton. Many interesting topics of this sort are suggested in the report of Mr. Danvers upon the primary authorities which will be used, it is to be hoped at no distant date, by a competent scholar.

The triumphant conclusion of the struggle with France for the predominance in India extended the sphere of influence of the East India Company to the eastern side of the Bay of Bengal. In earlier years their attempt to open trade with Burma and Siam had culminated in disaster. In 1687, the Company's servants at Mergui in Tenasserim, where a trade had been opened with the Siamese, were massacred, and a similar slaughter at Negrais in 1759 closed the attempt commenced six years earlier to open up commerce with the Burmese. But the free trading or "interloping" captains continued to carry on their venturesome business of commerce without intervention or protection of forts or factories. Through one of them, Captain Francis Light, came the first permanent settlement of the English in the Malay Peninsula. This enterprising voyager married the daughter of the native ruler of Kedah or Queda, and proposed to Warren Hastings in the name of his father-in-law to cede an island called Pulo Penang, off the west coast of the Malay Peninsula, to the East India Company, in return for a pension of six thousand dollars a year.[1] Warren Hastings had too much to do in saving the English in India to conclude this transaction, but his temporary successor, Sir John Macpherson, seized upon the opportunity and announced to the Court of Directors of the East India Company on March 25, 1786, that the British flag had been hoisted on the island of Penang, which was in courtly fashion given the new name of the Prince of Wales's Island. Macpherson considered this acquisition one of the chief glories of his brief administration and speaks of the new settlement as "advantageous for our fleets and beneficial to the trade with China, as well as to British and Asiatic commerce."[2] Captain Light governed Penang until his death in 1794 and the settlement advanced in prosperity under his patriarchal administration in spite of occasional disputes with the ruler of Kedah. About the time of his death the East India Company began to take a more direct interest in the little settlement. The Protestant Netherlands had been overrun by the French, and the Batavian Republic, which replaced the former government of the United Provinces, was at once at war with England. This gave the East India Company its opportunity for revenging itself for many humiliations and for putting an end to the power of the Dutch in Asia. It is unnecessary to specify the various naval operations, which, starting from Penang and Bencoolen as their bases, placed the British in possession of all the outposts of Dutch occupation in the Spice Islands. It is enough to state that the value of Penang became more and more evident. In 1802, the governor, Sir George Leith, increased the area of the settlement by acquiring from the ruler of Queda for ten thousand dollars a year of additional pension a district on the mainland opposite the island, eighteen miles long and three miles broad, which he named after the Governor-General of India, the Province Wellesley.[3] In 1805, Penang was formed into a presidency, like Madras and Bombay, with a governor and council corresponding directly with the Governor-General in India and the Court of Directors in England. Meanwhile, the outlying posts being conquered, it was resolved in 1810, by the Governor-General, Lord Minto, to complete the subjugation of the Dutch in India by the conquest of the island of Java. And now first appears upon the scene that most famous Englishman in Malay history, the future founder of English influence in Eastern seas. When Penang was made a presidency, it was resolved to send out from England a new establishment of officers for its administration. One member of this staff was a young man of twenty-four who had been for ten years an extra clerk in the India House and had there attracted the attention of one of the directors of the East India Company by his intelligence and diligence. Thomas Stamford Raffles soon gave evidence of his exceptional ability. He mastered the Malay language, became secretary to the Penang government, traveled with observant eyes through the Malay Peninsula and joined Lord Minto at Calcutta in time to aid in the direction of the expedition against Java. The English expedition was entirely successful, the Dutch lines at Cornelis were stormed by the British troops under the gallant Rollo Gillespie, and Dutch India passed into the hands of the East India Company in September 1811.[1]

---

[1] The text of this treaty and of its successor explaining it in 1791 is in Aitchison, *A Collection of Treaties, Engagements and Sunnuds relating to India and the Neighboring Countries*, Calcutta, 1876, Vol. I., pp. 302–307.

[2] See *The Case of Sir John Macpherson, Baronet, late Governor-General of India, containing a Summary Review of his Administration and Services prepared by Friends from authentie Documents*, August, 1808 [not published, but privately printed], p. 37.

[3] Aitchison, I. 305–307.

Raffles was appointed lieutenant-governor of Java and was given an opportunity of trying his hand at administration on a large scale. This is not the place to compare either the theory or the practice of Dutch and English administrators in Asia. It is enough to state that the whole of the Dutch system was utterly abhorrent to Stamford Raffles. It was based upon forced labor which Raffles and all other English observers have stigmatized as slavery or at the very least serfdom of the worst kind. The Dutch according to Raffles looked upon their possessions in the Spice Islands as sources of material wealth and did not regard themselves as owing any obligation to civilize or justly rule their Asiatic subjects. The problem of administering a vast agricultural community so as to allow personal freedom, self-respect and a fair share of the profits of their labor to the actual cultivators, had been honestly, if not always successfully, faced in India. Raffles applied the same ideas to Java. He abolished forced labor; he took the control of the police and of the administration of justice out of the hands of native chiefs and confided it to European officers, and by sympathetic treatment won the affection of the people of Java who had been terrorized into almost constant insurrection by the Dutch.

When the great war with Napoleon was over the English government resolved to deal generously with the Dutch. Selfish commercial considerations might have induced Lord Castlereagh and his colleagues in the English cabinet to retain the Spice Islands, and Raffles earnestly protested against restoring their former dependencies to the administrators who had shown so little understanding of native ideas. But considerations of European policy prevailed. The English ministry desired to make the new kingdom of the Netherlands a powerful state, and this they hoped to do by restoring to the Dutch their former possessions in the Eastern seas. The interests of the Malays were not consulted. By the order of the British government the former Dutch possessions in the Spice Islands together with the settlement of Malacca in the Malay Peninsula were restored to the Dutch in 1818, while the East India Company retained only its former settlements of Bencoolen and Penang. But the man was still in the English service whose foresight and administrative skill were to make up to the British Empire for the loss of Java, and Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles, who had been knighted during a visit to England, assumed the government of Bencoolen in Sumatra in 1818. He at once perceived that the generosity of the English ministers had given the Dutch a fresh opportunity, not only to hamper English trade with the Spice Islands, but even to control the direct passage from India to China through which the commerce of the Further East with Europe was obliged to pass. The Dutch government controlled the straits between Sumatra and Java and made preparations as soon as they had regained their former dependencies to arrange with the rulers of Johore and Rhio for control of the narrow passage between Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula. Raffles at once appealed to the Marquis of Hastings, the Governor-General of India, to avert this peril. The two English settlements of Bencoolen and Penang looked toward the West; Raffles saw that if England's commerce in the Far East was to attain its natural development it was necessary to control a passage-way to the China Sea and to establish some post that should look towards the East. For this purpose he selected the little island of Singapore, which lay off the extreme point of the Malay Peninsula. The island was almost uninhabited and eulogists of Raffles are apt to assert in the words of his biographer that it was "unknown alike to the European and the Indian world."[1] This is hardly true, for old Alexander Hamilton in his *New Account of the East Indies*, remarks: "In Anno 1703 I called at Johore on my Way to China, and he (the king of that place) treated me very kindly, and made me a Present of the Island of Singapore, but I told him it could be of no Use to a private Person, tho' a proper Place for a Company to settle a Colony on, lying in the Center of Trade and being accommodated with good Rivers and safe Harbours, so conveniently situated, that all Winds served Shipping both to go out and come into those Rivers."[1] Raffles was as much struck with the advantages of the island of Singapore as Hamilton, and he made arrangements with the rulers of Johore for the establishment of a factory there. A treaty was signed and the purchase of the island made on February 6, 1819;[2] a few days later the British flag was hoisted and the settlement commenced. Singapore was at first placed under the control of Bencoolen or Fort Marlborough, of which Raffles was governor, which gave him the opportunity to have the island and its approaches carefully surveyed, and the elements of prosperity secured by wise measures in laying out the future capital of the Straits Settlements. The Dutch vehemently protested against what they termed an invasion of their rights, and the matter was referred to the home governments in Europe. After long diplomatic negotiations it was arranged that the English should abandon Bencoolen, thus leaving the whole island of Sumatra to the Dutch, while the Dutch on their side gave up Malacca on the Malay Peninsula, the former capital of the Portuguese in Eastern seas, to the East India Company. It was further agreed that the control of the Peninsula should belong to the English and of Sumatra and Java to the Dutch, which prevented either nation from excluding the other from the direct passage to the China Sea. The treaty[3] embodying this important arrangement was signed on March 17, 1824, about a month after Sir Stamford Raffles had sailed from Asia for the last time.

---

[1] The best account of the conquest of Java is *Memoir of the Conquest of Java with the subsequent Operations of the British Forces in the Oriental Archipelago*, by Major William Thorn, London, 1815; see also Lady Minto's *Lord Minto in India*, London, 1880.

---

[1] *Dictionary of National Biography*, s. v.

The treaty of 1824 was followed by important measures of administrative concentration. Hitherto Penang and the Province Wellesley had been governed as an independent presidency corresponding with the Court of Directors, governed by a governor and council appointed in England, and administered by a covenanted civil service, with independent medical and other establishments similar to those existing in the presidencies of Madras and Bombay. Bencoolen or Fort Marlborough had likewise been regarded as an independent settlement, but it had never been raised to the rank of a presidency and its officials had held a somewhat anomalous position. One of the most important privileges of a presidency was that it possessed a High Court of Judicature, appointed directly from England from the English bar, which was invested by letters patent from the Crown with jurisdiction in all places and over all offences. The presidency of Penang, or as it was officially termed, Prince of Wales's Island, was too small to need a supreme court consisting of a chief justice and puisne judges, and it was therefore given a recorder's court, like that which existed at Bombay down to 1823, presided over by a single judge entitled the Recorder of Prince of Wales's Island. By the Act 5 George IV., cap. 108, the island of Singapore, which had hitherto been under Bencoolen, and the settlement of Malacca, which had been ceded by the Dutch to the English Crown, were transferred to the East India Company, and by 6 George IV., cap. 85, the Company was authorized to annex Singapore and Malacca to Prince of Wales's Island or otherwise as they might see fit.[1] Under the powers of this act the Directors of the East India Company on October 12, 1825, constituted the three settlements on the Malay Peninsula into one administrative government, to consist of a governor and three resident councillors, one of whom was to reside at each of the settlements. The jurisdiction of the Recorder of Prince of Wales's Island was extended and the Supreme Court of Judicature in each settlement was to consist of the recorder, the governor and the local resident councillor. A member of the Madras civil service, Mr. Robert Fullerton, was appointed governor, and the Company's officials formerly employed at Bencoolen were transferred to the service of the new government. Although Singapore rapidly advanced in prosperity the expense of the administration of the three settlements in the Malay Peninsula was so great that it was speedily resolved to reduce the status of the government. Lord William Bentinck, who had been sent out to India as Governor-General in 1828 on a mission of economy, carried out the reduction. The capital of the Malay settlements and the seat of the recorder's court were removed from Penang to Singapore in 1830; the separate civil service and other establishments were abolished; and the control of the settlements was confided to a resident at Singapore, who was made directly subject to the Governor-General of India and who was deprived of the status and salary and the privilege of communicating with the Court of Directors, which the governor had enjoyed. The former establishments of the Prince of Wales's Island presidency were amalgamated with those of Bengal, but it is worthy of note that the civilians who administered the government of the Malay settlements down to the end of the Company's existence were men who had been members of the old Prince of Wales's Island service, who had joined that establishment on coming to Asia, and who were therefore trained from the beginning of their career to a knowledge of Malay habits and customs and a perfect acquaintance with the Malay language.

---

[1] Ed. 1727, Vol. II., p 98.

[2] See the text of the treaty in Aitchison, I. 327–329.

[3] The text of the treaty is in Aitchison, I. 62–69. The important articles are the 9th, by which England cedes Fort Marlborough and engages that no British settlement shall be formed in Sumatra, and the 10th, by which the Dutch cede Malacca and make a similar engagement about the Malay Peninsula.

---

[1] *An Analysis of the Constitution of the East India Company and of the Laws passed by Parliament for the Government of their Affairs at Home and Abroad*, by Peter Auber, London, 1826, pp. 257–259, 382.

The laws administered in the Malay settlements were the regulations of the government of India which had been in force when Prince of Wales's Island was made a presidency in 1805, amended by the regulations made in the presidency itself by its governor in council. After 1830 all legislation remained in the hands of the Governor-General of India in Council; local regulations could be made by the resident at Singapore but had to be submitted to the Governor-General for confirmation. The recorder remained the chief judicial functionary, but magisterial powers were exercised, as in India, by the local officials who combined the functions of collecting the revenue and maintaining the peace. So large had been the staff of the former presidency that for many years no new covenanted civilians were needed and their clerical assistants were imported from the Madras presidency, while police duties were performed by Malays, officered by Europeans. The normal garrison for several years consisted of two regiments of Madras native infantry, although the general government was superintended from Bengal, for the Madras sepoys showed none of the objections to crossing the Bay of Bengal which characterized their Bengal brethren; and officers in the Madras army, who, when in garrison, took the trouble of learning the Malay language, were often detached from their regiments and appointed to administrative offices. Problems of administration were extremely simple in Penang and Malacca, from both of which places commerce soon departed to the better situated settlement at Singapore. In them the control of affairs was entrusted to officials termed resident councillors. Their main duties were to superintend cultivation, to improve it by introducing new staples, to collect the land revenue after the method in India, to do justice in patriarchal fashion and to lead the Malay cultivators into paths of industry. Their chief interest was in exploring the mainland beyond the limits of the little British provinces and their chief excitement, disputes with occasional hard fighting against the neighboring Malay chieftains.

In Singapore however the situation was entirely different. The almost uninhabited island soon became, as Raffles had foreseen, a commercial centre of great importance. Its safe harbor made it the natural stopping place of all ships sailing to China and it also became an entrepôt of island commerce, to the entire overshadowing of the Dutch capital at Batavia. From the very beginning Singapore had been declared a free port and since no customs dues were ever levied the trade of the Philippines, of Borneo, of Siam and the Moluccas converged to it. The advantages for trade were quickly observed by the Chinese, who flocked to Singapore in large numbers, and the control and management of the Chinese population presented features of peculiar difficulty to the British officials. The more ambitious among them, like Mr. S. G. Bonham, devoted themselves to the study of the Chinese language and the mastery of Chinese habits and customs, to the great advantage of the service of the state when the First Chinese War resulted in the possession by Great Britain of a Chinese dependency. The special foreign problems that faced the Singapore administration were the management of relations with the rulers of Johore, from whom the island had been purchased, and the necessity of taking measures to deal with the pirates who infested the neighboring seas and gravely interfered with the development of commerce. The government of India had almost reduced to a science the art of dealing with native rulers, and by alternate threats, concessions and the exertion of personal influence the successive early residents at Singapore, Mr. Ibbetson, Mr. Murchison and Mr. Bonham, managed to keep the peace with their neighbors of Johore and to avoid the necessities of war and annexation. The pirate difficulty was of more importance, and it was not until after the outbreak of the First Chinese War that the home government perceived the necessity of dealing with this evil by commencing a systematic attempt to put down piracy by the use of ships of the Royal Navy.

The imperial value of Singapore was first made evident during the war with the Chinese which began in 1841. It was at Singapore that the fleet and military expedition made their rendezvous, and Singapore was the real base of operations throughout the three campaigns that followed. The naval and military commanders all bore witness to the excellence of the harbor of Singapore; the accumulation of supplies there greatly increased the prosperity of the settlement, and it was at this time that this out-lying post of the dominions of the East India Company first became familiarly known to the English people. This is not the place to examine the causes or to trace the history of the First Chinese War. But it is necessary to notice briefly the relations of the East India Company with China and how and when those relations had been broken off, in order to show how it was that England's dependency of Hong

Kong was never under the control of the East India Company and was from the first administered as a crown colony. In the eighteenth century the East India Company possessed the monopoly of Chinese as well as of Indian trade, and many efforts were made to found some factory on the Chinese coast which could be held permanently for the collection and storage of cargoes for the annual shipment to England. The story of the obstinate resistance of the Chinese authorities to the settlement of an English factory belongs to the general history of the commerce of China with Europe. Owing to the impossibility of forming a factory the China trade of the East India Company was conducted from 1715 to 1770 by the supercargoes of the different ships sent to China, who were directed on arrival at Hong Kong to keep a common table and to act in harmony in fixing prices. The Chinese government prohibited trade elsewhere than at Canton, where a corporation known as the Hong merchants was formed to deal with the supercargoes for the management of foreign trade. In 1770 the East India Company resolved that the supercargoes should permanently reside in China instead of going to and fro on their ships as they had formerly done, and a regular establishment was formed resembling the mercantile staff of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay from which the covenanted civil services of the three Indian presidencies had grown. It is curious to note in the titles of the Company's civil officials in China traces of their origin. Whereas down to 1840 the civil servants in India, though rulers and judges, were still divided officially into the four classes of senior merchants, junior merchants, factors and writers, so in China the Company's servants were denominated until the break-up of the China establishment as supercargoes and writers. The governing body of the supercargoes was known as the Select Committee, and the president of the committee corresponded directly with the Court of Directors of the East India Company and was entirely independent of the Governor-General of India. The China establishment of the East India Company were not permitted for many years to reside on Chinese soil, and they therefore made their residences in the island of Macao, which belonged to the Portuguese and was situated in the mouth of the Canton River. Their work was easy and lucrative, and appointments to the China establishment were invariably given by the Directors of the East India Company to their own immediate relatives. Their duties were to provide for the Company's investment in China and they never became like their colleagues in India a service of statesmen and rulers. The most exciting events in the history of the Company's China establishment were the embassies sent by the English government to the Chinese emperor in 1793 under Lord Macartney and in 1816 under Lord Amherst. There were the usual troubles caused by free merchants interfering with the Company's monopoly and certain special and curious difficulties caused by the persistent prohibition of the Chinese government against the residence of European women in China. In 1813 the East India Company's monopoly of trade with India was abolished, but the monopoly of China trade was continued for a further period of twenty years.

The protest of the English merchants, however, made itself loudly heard, and the first reformed Parliament in 1833 abolished the monopoly of the China trade. The greater part of the former China establishment of the East India Company was transferred to the Bengal civil service, when the abolition of the monopoly was finally accomplished in 1834, and the home government had to appoint an imperial official, Lord Napier, as "superintendent of trade," in order that there might be some one with authority to deal with the corporation of the Hong merchants. Captain Charles Elliot succeeded Lord Napier in 1836, and during his tenure of office the events occurred which led to the outbreak of the First Chinese War. One of the most important results of that war was the cession to Great Britain of the island of Hong Kong. This dependency was from the very first classed as a crown colony and governed directly through the Colonial Office. Its first three governors were indeed servants of the East India Company, for Sir Henry Pottinger was an officer in the Bombay army, Sir John Davis a member of the former Chinese establishment, and Sir George Bonham a successful resident at Singapore, but they had none of them during their government any direct connection with India. It was their experience in the Company's service, however, which made them the successful administrators of the new possession. The laws and local regulations which they put into force closely resembled those which had proved successful at Singapore; they drew their administrators mainly from India, until an effective Hong Kong civil service had been brought into being, and in particular they made Hong Kong, like Singapore, a free port, and imitated the Singapore trade regulations. While admitting, therefore, that the administrative history of the dependency of Hong Kong is distinctly differentiated from that of the Straits Settlements in that it owes nothing directly to Indian influence, it may yet be said that it could hardly have been so immediately and entirely successful had it not had Indian example to guide it and Indian administrators to watch over its growth. The problems of Hong Kong were those of Singapore over again, without the complications arising from the mixture of Chinese and Malay inhabitants, and the way in which those problems have been met in such manner as to create two flourishing Asiatic dependencies, commanding two strategic points and controlling vast commerce, has reflected credit upon the administrators formed in the great school of the East India Company. It should be added that in Hong Kong, as in Singapore and India itself, care was taken to separate the supreme judiciary authority from the administration, so that there should exist to deal with important cases and in appeal from administrative officers exercising magisterial functions an entirely unbiassed court, consisting of a judge or judges appointed from the English bar, which could control unjust administration by its legal knowledge and complete independence.

It cannot be said that the Chinese War or the annexation of Hong Kong were in any way due to the British occupation of Singapore, although that occupation simplified the military and naval operations; it was otherwise with the expansion of British power in the island of Borneo, which was the direct outcome of the struggles entered into with the Malay pirates as Singapore became more and more the centre of the island trade. The treaty with the Dutch of 1824 declared that "no British establishments shall be made on . . . . or on any of the other islands south of the Straits of Singapore, nor any treaty concluded by British authority with the chiefs of those islands."[1] The island of Borneo lies partly to the south of the Straits and the Dutch appealed to this treaty to prevent British extension there. This had its weight undoubtedly in preventing the direct extension of British power on that island, where it was left to a British subject and to a British company to establish sovereignty. Yet many attempts had been made by the East India Company during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to establish factories in Borneo, and the failure of these factories had been due as much to the persistent opposition of the Dutch as to the ferocity of the Malay inhabitants. It is worth noting that in the sixteenth century the Portuguese had from their capital at Malacca exercised considerably more influence over Borneo than their successors the Dutch had ever done from Batavia or the Spaniards had effected from the neighboring Philippines. The language of the natives abounds in words derived from the Portuguese,[2] while the Dutch and the Spaniards have made but little impression upon the minds of the people. It was from Borneo that the most daring pirates of the China Sea set out to prey upon all passing commerce, and spasmodic efforts were made by ships of the Indian navy after the occupation of Singapore to suppress this piracy.[1] But the Singapore government itself could do little in this direction and the first vigorous efforts were made by an English adventurer, the celebrated Rájá Brooke.

---

[1] Aitchison, I. 67, Article II of the treaty.

[2] Information derived from Mr. Charles Hose of the Rájá of Saráwak's service.

James Brooke[2] was the son of a distinguished member of the Bengal civil service and was an officer in the Bengal army from 1819 to 1830. In the year in which he left the army he first visited the Straits Settlements, and in 1838, attracted by the prospects there, he sailed from England on a personal adventure in a ship owned and commanded by himself. It was his deliberate purpose to introduce British ascendancy into Borneo, and he soon established a remarkable reputation and obtained an extraordinary influence over the Malay and Dayak inhabitants of that island. This led the Sultan of Brunei, the chief native ruler, to confer upon him the nucleus of the present state of Saráwak with the title of Rájá in 1842. It is not necessary here to deal with the romantic life of Rájá Brooke in Borneo; it is enough to note that his experience led him to abolish forced trade and every sort of slavery and to establish in its place a simple system of administration. He dispensed justice among his people in patriarchal fashion and won their affection. He was exceedingly desirous from the very first to make it clearly understood that he was not instigated by personal ambition, but that he wished to use his authority to extend British influence and to ameliorate the lot of the natives. He co-operated heartily with the officers of the Royal Navy in suppressing piracy[3] and induced the Sultan of Brunei in 1846 to cede to the British government the little island of Labuan at the mouth of the Saráwak River as a commanding point for operations against the pirates and as possessing coal mines which might be usefully worked. He was himself the first governor of Labuan, and he trained there and at Saráwak many men who learnt from him the management of Malays, among whom perhaps the most distinguished was the present Sir Hugh Low. Close communication was naturally maintained between the British dependency of Labuan, the independent state of Saráwak and the East India Company's settlement at Singapore, although the three were under entirely different anthorities. Rájá Brooke found the Chinese as inevitable and as difficult to handle in Sarâwak as successive governors found them at Singapore. They were the only people of commercial aptitude and therefore outwitted the more backward Malays. Trade on anything like an extensive scale was only possible through Chinese agency. Yet neither Brooke nor any of the English administrators liked the Chinese. Their secret societies banded them together against the authorities whenever they disapproved of any tax or police measure. They were not amenable to the arguments which could be effectively applied to savage and uncivilized races. They were clever enough to combine against anything of which they disapproved and the forces of European civilization were unable to influence them. In 1857 the Chinese of Sarâwak made an attempt to murder Rájá Brooke and his English associates; he saved his life with difficulty and recovered his authority only by the fidelity of the Malays and Dayaks.

---

[1] *History of the Indian Navy*, by C. R. Low, *passim*.

[2] For the biography of Rájá Brooke, see *Life of Sir James Brooke, Rajah of Sarawak*, by Sir Spenser St. John, London, 1879, and *An Account of Rajah Brooke*, by Gertrude L. Jacob, London, 1876.

[3] See *The Expedition to Borneo of H. M. S. "Dido" for the Suppression of Piracy*, London, 1846, and *A Visit to the Indian Archipelago in H. M. S. "Mæander,"* London, 1853, by Capt. the Hon. (now Sir) Henry Keppel; *Narrative of the Voyage of H. M. S. "Samarang," 1843–46, in the Eastern Archipelago*, by Capt. Sir Edward Belcher, 1848; and *Narrative of Events in Borneo and Celebes down to the Occupation of Labuan*, by Capt. (afterward Sir) George Rodney Mundy, London, 1848.

During the period in which Rájá Brooke was establishing himself in Borneo and the British administration at Hong Kong was being placed upon a permanent footing under the Colonial Office, the Straits Settlements of Singapore, Penang and Malacca continued to be governed from Calcutta as part of the territories of the East India Company. Experience had shown that the best method of dealing with the troublesome Chinese question was to inspire the leaders of the Chinese mercantile community with confidence in the administration and to use them to control their brethren. One old gentleman in particular, named Whampoa, fills a large place in the records of the time as the representative Chinaman and as the confidant of the governor in all Chinese questions. Still more serious for the protection of trade was the question of dealing with piracy. To the east of Singapore this matter was dealt with mainly by ships of the Royal Navy, aided by Rájá Brooke; in the Dutch islands the Dutch ships co-operated; but the government of the Straits Settlements had to do the work for itself along the Malay Peninsula. The Malays were daring and inveterate pirates and the government at Singapore was first brought into contact with the various native states in the Malay Peninsula by negotiations for the suppression of piracy. A series of treaties was made with the different native states for this purpose, of which the most important was signed with the Sultan of Perak on October 18, 1826, by which the Sultan ceded to the East India Company the territory known as the Dindings, including the island of Pangkor, a district containing about two hundred square miles, eighty miles to the south of Penang and celebrated as a pirate haunt.[1] The negotiations with these Malay chiefs were carried on by officers who had the experience of the government of India to go upon, and although it was not then considered expedient to appoint residents to the native states the way was paved for that policy. The most serious difficulty that arose during these varied negotiations was as to the question of the sovereignty of these petty rulers. It was only after many treaties had been entered into that it was discovered that the King of Siam possessed a sort of shadowy supremacy over the whole Malay Peninsula. This led to long and complicated negotiations with him and to the sending of many embassies to Bangkok, of which the most important were those of Mr. John Crawfurd in 1821, Capt. Henry Burney in 1826 and Sir James Brooke from Sarâwak in 1850.

The great Bengal Mutiny of 1857 did not affect the prosperity of the Malay settlements, for the regiments in garrison at Penang and Singapore belonged to the Madras army, which was not implicated in the insurrection. But as a result of the Mutiny the East India Company ceased to exist, and all its dominions passed to the British Crown. The Malay settlements for a time continued to be governed from Calcutta and in 1861 the last Indian officer was appointed to administer the dependencies. By this time the line of civilians who had originally been trained in the old Prince of Wales's Island civil service had died out and the last of them, Mr. E. A. Blundell, sent in his resignation. The subordinate posts had long been held by Bengal civilians, or by officers detached from the Madras army who had learnt the Malay language while stationed with their regiments at Penang or Singapore. The governor appointed in 1861 had however not previously been employed in the Malay Peninsula. He was Colonel Orfeur Cavenagh, an old Bengal officer who had lost a leg at the battle of Mahârâjpur and had done good service during the Mutiny as town- and fort-major of Calcutta. It so happens that Cavenagh was inspired towards the end of his long and useful life to publish a small volume which he entitled *Reminiscences of an Indian Official.*[2] In this book he gives a full and interesting account of his administration of the Malay settlements, abounding in quotations from documents and in personal anecdotes. An animated description is given of his management of the Chinese at Singapore, of his annual tours to Malacca and Penang, of his intercourse with the Dutch, of his visit to Sarâwak and of his experiences with the Siamese. It is fortunate for students of the history of the British settlements in the Malay Peninsula that there exists such a volume as Cavenagh's *Reminiscences*, and reference can safely be made to it for a striking and faithful picture of administration in that part of the world thirty years ago. He boasts of the proved value of Singapore to the Empire during the Second Chinese War and prides himself on the growth in its prosperity during his government. Like other Indian officers he had a very poor opinion of the Dutch administration in the neighboring islands, which he declares to be based on wrong principles. "Although Holland honestly strives," he says, "to improve the material condition of the native races under her rule, her yoke is heavy, and they are denied the blessings of real freedom. Some day they may discover her weakness and their own strength. Her empire in the East may be compared to a bow too highly strung; should the cord once snap there would be a complete collapse."[1] This prophecy has not yet come true, but the long and bitter wars that the Dutch have been forced to wage against the Achinese in Sumatra have more than once imperilled their authority. One other quotation upon the character of the Malays may be made from Cavenagh's book, because it gives such a different point of view to that of those observers who regard the Malays as a race of treacherous pirates, and because it illustrates the universal endeavor of English administrators to promote education. "The Malays," he says, "in many respects resemble my own countrymen" (Cavenagh was an Irishman); "they are quick-witted, easily excited, ready to undergo any amount of fatigue in the way of sport or amusement, but not, as a rule, much given to steady labor, and greatly under the influence of their priests. Knowing this last circumstance, when I commenced the introduction of elementary education, wherever the village priest was qualified I placed him at the head of the local school. He consequently became a supporter instead of an opponent of the government, and it was a priest who, in the first instance, increased the number of his scholars by the presence of his own daughter, and was pleased at the notice her cleverness attracted. His example was followed by others and there were three or four schools where boys and girls received instruction in the same classes."[2]

---

[1] Aitchison, I. 310, 311.

[2] London, 1884.

In 1866 it was resolved to transfer the Malay dependencies from the superintendence of the government of India, and the Straits Settlements were formed into a crown colony administered directly from the Colonial Office, like Hong Kong and Labuan. There was much to be said in favor of this important administrative change. The problems of administration were different from those in India and it was a little absurd that the legislation necessary for the Malay settlements should have to pass under the supervision of the government of India. There are some experienced British administrators in Asia who would go a step further and who would remove Burma from the control of that government in consideration of the fact that the Burmese people differ in race and religion from the peoples of India, and who would make a separate vice-royalty of Burma and the Malay Peninsula, giving, perhaps, the administration of Ceylon instead to the government of India. At any rate it must be admitted that the Malay settlements have owed much to the wisdom and devotion of their Anglo-Indian administrators, and that when they were handed over to the Colonial Office they were transferred in a flourishing condition, with a fine staff of officials and splendid traditions of administrative duty. By the Act 29 and 30 Victoria, cap. 115, the government of the Straits Settlements was formed on the model of that of the other crown colonies, with a governor aided by an executive and a legislative council, with a Straits Settlement civil service, vacancies in which were filled by public competition, with a High Court of Justice consisting of a chief justice and two puisne judges, appointed from the English bar, and with a garrison directly under the control of the War Office. The act took effect in the following year. Colonel Cavenagh was somewhat ungraciously superseded without any official notification and on April 1, 1867, the first of the new governors, Major-General Sir Harry Ord, took up his appointment.

---

[1] Cavenagh, p. 340.

[2] Cavenagh, pp. 262, 263.

The change in the position of the settlements on the Malay Peninsula from being subordinate to the government of India into the crown colony of the Straits Settlements led to many important developments in both internal and external policy. The lines of development indeed had been laid down by the East India Company's officials, but the imperial officers who succeeded them had a more direct interest in the colony as a part of the British imperial system. One of the chief reasons for the change of status was the recognition in London of the commercial and strategic importance of Singapore. Even before Colonel Cavenagh was superseded a commission had been sent out, of which the most important members were Sir Hercules Robinson and Colonel Sir William Jervois, to report upon the defences of Singapore, and it is worthy of note that the first colonial governors of the Straits Settlements, Sir Harry Ord, Sir Andrew Clarke and Sir William Jervois, were all officers of the Royal Engineers. Under their supervision an elaborate system of fortification was undertaken the expenses of which were defrayed out of the colonial revenues. Although the garrison maintained at Singapore consists of only one regiment of British infantry, with details of artillery, engineers and submarine miners, the importance of its situation is thoroughly recognized and it forms the essential link between British interests in the Indian and the China Seas.

The imperial governors, though at first mainly occupied with the question of military defence, were not blind to the necessity of encouraging commerce, and because in the nature of things the continued prosperity of the province of Singapore depended upon the management of the Chinese a regular Chinese department was established with a branch at Penang. Certain officers of the Straits Settlement civil service, who showed special ability in mastering the Chinese language and special aptitude for dealing with the Chinese settlers, were detached for this department, and the office of "Protector of the Chinese" was created. It was realized that a special training was necessary for effectually dealing with Chinamen, and the creation of a special Chinese department, trained to keep track of the working of the Chinese community with its secret societies, its peculiar habits and extraordinary powers of combination, greatly simplified the management of the Chinese problem. Perhaps it may not be thought egotistic in the present writer here to remark that the present Protector of Chinese in the Straits Settlements is an old school-fellow, Mr. G. C. Wray, who even as a school-boy gave promise of a distinguished career alike by his ability in learning languages and by his skill in managing boys. Experience has amply shown the advantage of a special Chinese department if an Asiatic dependency like Singapore is to derive commercial advantages from the industry and intelligence of Chinese merchants, while controlling and checking the various dangerous and criminal proclivities of their compatriots.

In dealing with the Malays the chief difficulty bequeathed to the colonial government of the Straits Settlements by the East India Company was the relation between the British patches of directly governed territory and the independent Malay states which surrounded them. It has been already pointed out that the East India Company's governors and residents entered into negotiations with many of these states for the purpose of suppressing piracy. There had been more than one petty war, and it was felt to be highly desirable that definite relations should be established. This was not done by annexation. The example of India had shown that it was both more economical and more consistent with the legitimate national aspirations of the people, to recognize and control native rulers than to abolish them altogether and annex their territories. The example of Dalhousie's government of India has had a wholesome effect on English policy in the Malay Peninsula. The governor who first attempted to deal with the problem of the Malay native states as a connected whole was Sir Andrew Clarke, who in the year 1874 signed treaties with the Malay states of Perak, Selangor and Sungei Ujong by which the rulers of those states entered into relations with the government of the Straits Settlements, not unlike those entered into by the feudatory states with the government of India, binding each native ruler to accept the presence of a British Resident who should advise the ruler as to his duties. This loss of independence, for however disguised it might be, the presence of a British Resident did diminish the importance of the native ruler, led to an outbreak in Perak. The British Resident, Mr. Birch, was murdered at the instigation of the Sultan in 1875, and military operations had to be undertaken. The campaign, which was directed by General the Hon. Francis Colborne, was short and brilliant. The advance was led by the First Gurkha Regiment, which penetrated the fastnesses of the Malay kingdom, and Capt. G. N. Channer won a Victoria Cross for a deed of exceeding daring in turning the enemies' most formidable line of defence. The Sultan surrendered and was deported. But the country was not annexed; a relative was placed upon the throne and from that time on the control of the Malay states through British Residents has been the rule throughout the Malay Peninsula.

Sir Frederick Weld, who governed the Straits Settlements from 1880 to 1887, continued the work of spreading the British protectorate over the native Malay states by bringing under the control of British Residents the confederated states of Negri Sembilan in 1886 and the important state of Pahang in 1887. In each of these native states British government was introduced in the names of the respective rulers by officers of the Straits Settlement civil service. The collection of the revenues was revised so as to be just and enlightened instead of arbitrary; public works were undertaken on an extensive scale; forces of police were established for the maintenance of the peace; sanitary regulations were enforced; and the native rulers were trained by the British Residents in modern ideas of administrative efficiency. But the national pride of the Malays was not as much injured as it would have been by annexation, and their religious fanaticism was not outraged by the overthrow of their Muhammadan sultans and ancient native dynasties. In 1895 the states of Sungei Ujong and Negri Sembilan were amalgamated under a single British Resident and in July 1896 an important step was taken for the promotion of administrative harmony. A treaty was signed between the four protected states, forming a federation under the general control of a Resident-General, and the federated states agreed to furnish troops for colonial service in case of war. The governor of the Straits Settlements was further given the office of High Commissioner of the Federated States and his position was assimilated to that of the governor of Cape Colony, who is also High Commissioner for South Africa, and of the governor of Fiji, who is also High-Commissioner for the Western Pacific. The credit of acquiring the control of the Malay Peninsula with the least possible friction to native sensibilities belongs partly to the successive governors of the Straits Settlements, but they would be the first to admit that their success was mainly due to the exceptional knowledge of the Malay character possessed by well trained and experienced officials like Sir Hugh Low, the pupil and friend of Rájá Brooke, who for forty years was the most efficient administrator and agent of civilization among the Malays, and Sir Frank Swettenham, the present Resident-General in the Malay Protectorate.

A word must be added about the native state of Johore which lies between the Malay Protectorate and Singapore. The sultans of this state ever since the cession of Singapore have made their chief residence in the island and have become semi-Europeanized, to the adoption, indeed, it is said, of European vices as well as European virtues. The state is administered on British lines and, although not technically, is practically a protected state. It is not necessary here to enter into the details of the various treaties made with the state of Johore, which are complicated by the rival claims to sovereignty of the sultan and a chief entitled the Tumangong; it is enough to state that in 1887 the treaty was signed by which all foreign relations of the state of Johore were confided to the government of the Straits Settlements.

The friendly relations established in the days of the East India Company between Singapore and Saráwak have been maintained since the control of the Straits Settlements passed from the East India Company to the Crown. In 1868 Rájá Brooke died and was succeeded by his nephew the present Rájá, who is in England Sir Charles Johnson Brooke. The second Rájá has followed the policy of his famous uncle and administered his state not so much for private profit as for the extension of the prosperity of his subjects. The state of Saráwak has steadily expanded with the consent of the British government through cessions made by the Sultan of Brunei, and the second Rájá of Saráwak now rules over a territory of 41,000 square miles, containing a population of over 300,000. The policy of taming the Dayaks of Borneo has steadily proceeded and their most objectionable practices, such as piracy and head-hunting, have been checked. The officers of the Rájá of Saráwak have been active in reclaiming to civilization his savage subjects, and have done this without forcing upon them too rapidly the ideas of Europe. It is the practice of the rájá to entrust his officials with wider power and larger responsibility than is done by the government of the Straits Settlements, and with the happiest results. This is not the place to narrate the fascinating tales told to the present writer by Mr. Charles Hose, a member of the Saráwak civil service. This able officer is perhaps better known as a naturalist and explorer than as an administrator. His identification of the flora and fauna of the mountains of Borneo with that of the Himaláyas has proved that Borneo belongs to the Asiatic and not to the Papuan system. His travels have done something to open up the unknown interior of the island and his mastery of the Malay character has enabled him to obtain a degree of personal influence over his people which may be expected to lead to further results. As the Saráwak state has increased its borders and become more prosperous, the Chinese difficulty has continued to grow. Wherever towns are established as centres of trade and seats of government the Chinese come, and the difficulty of keeping the peace between them and the Malays is very great. With regard to the position of the Rájá of Saráwak it is to be noted that he possesses all the attributes of internal sovereignty. He arranges the collection of his revenue, including among its sources, somewhat to the indignation of purists, gambling licenses; he issues his own stamps; and he legislates for his dominions. He governs with the assistance of a council consisting of his chief English officials and certain leading natives, and his territories are divided up into districts governed by officers termed "residents," who perform judicial as well as administrative functions. There is no supreme court of justice in Saráwak; appeals are heard by the Rájá in council, and in this respect may be seen a marked difference from the administration of the Straits Settlements. A further distinction is to be noted in the fact that the Rájá's police force consists entirely of Malays, and that he does not, like the government of the Straits Settlements and the North Borneo Company, import Sikh police from India. By a treaty signed on June 14, 1888, the state of Saráwak was officially placed under British protection. The Queen's government undertook not to interfere with the internal administration, but was given the power to determine any question that might arise as to the succession to the throne, to control all foreign relations and to establish consuls, while the Rájá of Saráwak agreed on his side not to alienate or to annex any territory without consent from London. To fulfil the duties of the protectorate thus assumed by England the governor of the Straits Settlements for the time being is appointed to act as High Commissioner over English territory in the island of Borneo.

The protectorate of Borneo includes besides Saráwak the territories administered by the British North Borneo Company. This company, which received its charter of incorporation on November 1, 1881, was the first of the new chartered companies which have during the last few years been extending British influence in various parts of the world. The revival of companies with governing powers as a part of the British system of expansion forms an interesting chapter of recent history. It would of course be absurd to compare the British North Borneo Company to the famous East India Company, but some of its contemporaries in Africa seem likely to reproduce in another continent the work formerly accomplished in Asia. The British North Borneo Company arose out of certain grants of territory made by the independent sultans of Brunei and Sulu to Mr., now Sir, Alfred Dent in 1877 and 1878. It is a proof of the changed ideas of the last half-century that Mr. Dent, instead of administering the territory granted to him personally, as Rájá Brooke did, preferred to make over the territory to a company formed for the express purpose of exploiting it. The powers of the Company are carefully laid down in its charter and the home government consists of a Court of Directors, eight in number, elected by the stockholders. The company is not commercial but governing, and its profits are derived entirely from administrative sources. It is prevented by its charter from becoming the possessor of a commercial monopoly, and its trade is freely thrown open to all merchants complying with its regulations and paying fixed custom duties. After the company had shown its capacity for effective government in North Borneo the British government entered into closer relations with it, and on May 12, 1888, a formal protectorate was declared over the North Borneo Company's territories under which all the foreign relations of the Company were transferred to the Crown, while it was declared independent in all matters of internal administration. A further step was taken to bind the Company and the Colonial Office more closely together in 1889. In that year the island of Labuan, which was too small to justify an independent colonial government and which had failed to fulfill the hopes of Rájá Brooke as an outpost of British trade, was handed over to the British North Borneo Company. It was agreed that the governor of British North Borneo should be likewise governor of Labuan, and the Colonial Office was relieved of the expense of the island dependency.

The administration of the territories of the British North Borneo Company is based upon the ideas in practice in the Straits Settlements rather than upon those of Saráwak. The first officials came from the Straits Settlements, which may account for this fact. The territories are divided into nine provinces, each under the control of a Resident, who exercises the powers of the resident councillors at Penang and Malacca, which greatly resemble those of the Collector of an Indian district in that they are both administrative and magisterial. At the head of the administration is the governor, who is not aided by a council, as in Saráwak, but is made directly responsible for the good order of the territories to the Court of Directors in London. The Company derives its revenue from import duties, stamps, a poll-tax and the sale of land. It has its own coinage and postage stamps, but it does not issue licenses for gambling or resort to some of the other methods of obtaining revenue which are adopted in Saráwak. The most striking difference of the two Borneo governments is to be seen, however, in their police systems. The first governor of the British North Borneo Company's territories, Mr. C. Vandeleur Creagh, was originally an officer in the Punjab police and made his reputation by raising in 1867 the Sikh police force, which was then introduced into the island of Hong Kong. When he was transferred from Hong Kong to the Straits Settlements in 1383 he showed his belief in the efficiency of Sikh police by raising a similar force for service in the protected native state of Perak. He pursued the same policy in North Borneo, where the maintenance of the peace is confided to a force of about 300 Sikhs under the command of English officers. The officials of the Rájá of Saráwak are opposed to the use of Sikhs in their districts. They assert that the natives of India cannot deal successfully with the natives of Borneo, and they prefer to rely upon Malay and Dayak policemen raised and trained by themselves rather than upon foreigners. Without pronouncing upon this controversy it is worth noting that there has been more than one serious outbreak in North Borneo, in which British officers have lost their lives, whereas peace has reigned throughout the government of the second Rájá of Saráwak.

The consideration that naturally suggests itself after this brief summary of the administrative evolution of the British dependencies in the Further East is the absence of any harmonious idea in the extension of British power or in the manner in which it is administered. For two hundred years various efforts were made by the East India Company to establish trading settlements in the Spice Islands, but spasmodically and without method. The rivalry of the

Dutch hindered their success, and in haphazard fashion, in order to save its existence amidst the anarchy which followed the break-up of the Mughal Empire and under the pressure of rivalry from France which threatened extinction to its trade, the East India Company laid the foundation of the British power in India rather than in the Further East. Considerations of European policy led the British in India to occupy the Dutch possessions in the Further East during the Napoleonic War, but a sentiment of generosity dictated by European political considerations caused the return of these Dutch possessions to their former owners in 1815. The temporary occupation of the Spice Islands had opened a vista of trade and power in the Further East. The English statesmen and merchants did not realize their opportunity, but a true builder of empire appeared in the person of Sir Stamford Raffles, and Singapore was chosen as the nucleus of future British development. The treaty of 1824 left the English supreme in the Malay Peninsula and prevented the Dutch from closing the path to the China Sea. Slowly, as a dependency of the East India Company, the free port of Singapore became one of the central points of the Asiatic trade. Further extension was the work in China of the British government and in Borneo of individual Englishmen. The First Chinese War gave to England the island of Hong Kong, while the same decade saw the foundation of the principality of Sarâwak, and forty years later the British North Borneo Company undertook independently the extension of Rájá Brooke's work in the island of Borneo. The whole story of extension illustrates the haphazard way in which the British Empire has been built up, and is a further proof that the extension of that empire has been the work not of far-seeing statesmen, but of the support by the government of individual energy.

The administration of the dependencies in the Further East bears the marks of their historic evolution. The law administered in the Straits Settlements is the common statute law of England as it was in 1826, when the separate Prince of Wales's Island government or presidency ceased to exist, modified by acts passed by the government of India up to 1867, when the Straits Settlements, as an independent entity under the Colonial Office, was empowered to legislate for itself. The Indian penal code with slight local modifications has been adopted and there is a civil procedure code based on the English judicature acts. In Hong Kong, where the East India Company never held sway, Indian precedents and statute laws have no authority, and the English common law is the basis of the legal system, modified by the laws passed by the colonial legislative authority. In British North Borneo, the Straits Settlements law has been adopted with slight amendments, while in Saráwak the code enforced is simpler and its administration more patriarchal.

Although the law administered differs, and the systems of administration show marked divergences, the men who govern the natives in the Straits Settlements, in Hong Kong, in Saráwak and in British North Borneo come from the same class and are trained in the same traditions and ideals. Entrance to the civil service of Hong Kong and the Straits Settlements is obtained after a competitive examination open to all subjects of the Queen, and in subjects intended to attract candidates from the great English schools and the universities. The examination is now the same as that for the Indian covenanted civil service, and the young man who wins an appointment has won for himself a career in life. On joining his appointment in Asia, he at once receives a salary of $1500 and is set to work to learn the native language. On passing in the languages, he is attached to some branch of the service, and begins his administrative work under the instruction of an experienced official. He is tried in various places and positions to discover his aptitudes, and if he be intelligent and industrious, he rises to high and well-paid official positions. At the expiration of his allotted term of service, he retires with a liberal and well-earned pension. The prospect attracts men of marked ability. Young Englishmen of the middle or professional classes have more liking for administration than for business. Many of them have had relatives in various branches of the Indian and colonial services for many generations and possess hereditary traditions of service in the East. The open-air life, the love of sport and travel, a real liking for the details of governing backward peoples, attract them to enter the service ; and once in it, enthusiasm develops their powers. British North Borneo and Saráwak draw their officials from the same class, but without competitive examination, and it sometimes happens that they obtain the services of excellent men who possess all the necessary qualifications, but who have not been able to stand the strain of competitive examination.

The system is not ideal in itself—what government of Asiatics by Europeans is likely to be?—but it may be asserted that the British system in the Further East, as in India, is the result of long experience, and that the officials form a body of highly trained administrators sprung from the very flower of English manhood, selected without fear or favor, promoted only after proof of efficiency, and looking upon their career as the means not only of gaining an honorable livelihood for themselves, but also of promoting, to the honor and glory of England, the extension of Christian civilization in the Further East. H. MORSE STEPHENS.

THE CONNECTICUT LOYALISTS

At the beginning of the War for American Independence Connecticut occupied a phenomenal position in the political hemisphere. For nearly a century and a half she had been an independent republic *de facto*. In her ability to govern herself she stood preeminent among her sister colonies of the Revolutionary period. Her treatment of threatening internal ills—of Toryism[1] in particular—was prophylactic in character at the outset; in truth, throughout the entire great struggle, tory-germs of civil disorder were rarely suffered to develop beyond the embryo.

The party of the Loyalists was not lacking in men whose principles command respect. Of this class was he whose conservatism led him honestly to fear anarchy and confusion as a result of the so-called "experiment" in popular self-government. But it may be questioned why even such a man should have been found a "Non-Associator" in the stable little republic, whose people had governed themselves wisely and well for more than a hundred years.[2] Unlike his brethren of other provinces, he was not to be frightened at the alternative presented where there was no legislature; where royal governors, after subverting assemblies, had themselves abdicated their authority; where the "officious and offensive" grasped the reins of government, for which, it was urged, "they could adduce the laws of neither God nor man."[3] This plea was not valid in Connecticut. She had not then, and had never had, demagogues at the head of her affairs.

"In no state in the world," observes President Dwight, "was an individual of more importance as a man than in Connecticut. Such a degree of freedom was never before united with such a degree of stability; or so much individual consequence in all the members of a community with such cheerful and uniform obedience to its laws. Few places in the world," he believes, "presented a fairer example of peace and good order."[1]

---

[1] "Probably no one of the thirteen original states was as active, alert and efficient in the restraint of Tories during the war, as our own state of Connecticut." Jonathan Trumbull, in *Year-Book* (1895–6) *of the Connecticut Sons of the American Revolution*, 183. Cf. Sanford's *Connecticut*, 222.

[2] The Connecticut pioneers were firm believers in representative democracy. "*By a free choice*," said Hooker, "the hearts of the people will be more inclined to the love of the persons chosen, and more ready to yield obedience." *Notes* to Hooker's *Sermon* (May 31, 1638). Cf. *The 250th Anniversary of the Adoption of the Constitution*, published in January 1889 by the Connecticut Historical Society, p. 45.

[3] Cf. Dr. G. E. Ellis's "The Loyalists and their Fortunes," in Winsor's *America*, VII. 191.

The outbreak of hostilities brought no upheaval here in the leadership of affairs. The governor and both branches of the legislature worked together in harmony, and, being chosen by the freemen themselves, were enabled to legislate favorably to the popular will. The people understood their privileges, were strongly attached to their ancient constitution, and defended it at all times. They regarded it as their native, indefeasible right to be subject to no laws except those made by their own representatives. Their bitterest detractor, Rev. Samuel Peters, says, satirically, that "the multitude considered their General Assembly to be equal to the British Parliament." He admits that "they were empowered to make laws in Church and State agreeable to their own will and pleasure, without the King's approbation."[2]

The constitution[3] had been formed and adopted by the freemen in person, as early as January 1639; acceded to and ratified, twenty-three years later, by the liberal charter of Charles II. Extensive powers were vested in their own elected governor and council; yet so jealous were the people of their liberty that, if the former failed to call the legislature after being petitioned by the freemen, then the constables of the several towns were to convoke the legislature, which body could choose a moderator to act as governor, and the body thus formed had all legislative authority. Such an emergency, however, never arose: the governor and members of the assembly had all served their apprenticeship at town meetings, had held some town office, and, proving satisfactory, had been promoted to their respective positions. They were themselves from and of the people, and appreciated the people's needs. So pervasive was the democratic spirit that even the negroes of the colony (who, in 1774, numbered about six thousand) had become infected, and for several years elected their governor annually—continuing to do so for a time, it is said, after the close of the war. Not to be outdone by their masters the blacks treated their sable executive with profound respect, and he never failed to receive the honorable title of "Governor" when addressed by any of his colored constituents.

---

[1] Dwight's *Travels*, I. 196, 285–286.

[2] In the Charter of 1662, Charles II. retained no veto power.

[3] "It is worthy of note that this document contains none of the conventional references to a 'dread sovereign' or a 'gracious King,' nor the slightest allusion to the British or any other government outside of Connecticut itself." Fiske's *Beginnings of New England*, 127–128. Neither was there any mention made of the English company, holding a patent of the land.

At the beginning of the war there were six counties and seventy-two townships in the state. Each county had its sheriff and judges, built and repaired its own court-houses and jails, and taxed itself for that purpose. Every town had its three or more selectmen (frequently seven), two or more justices of the peace, two or more constables, town clerk, town treasurer, surveyors of highways (sometimes a score in number), fence-viewers, listers, collectors of taxes, leather-sealers, grand jurors, tithingmen, hay-wards, chimney-viewers, gaugers, packers, sealers of weights and measures, key-keepers, recorders of "sheep-marks," etc. Including state, county and town officials there were at least three thousand men holding public office in the state, each of whom had sworn to do his duty conformably to its constitution and laws. The selectmen were the executive officers of the town, and, like all others, were elected annually at the town meetings by the voters themselves.

These seventy-two townships were so many little republics,[1] where, at the annual meetings, the people were early schooled in the art of self-government, and where they learned to protect themselves from their enemies. Here their legislators and local officers first learned to do public business, and to do it peaceably and in good order. It was an old and established law that, if a person interrupted or disturbed the order, peace or proceedings of a town meeting, or hindered the choice of a moderator, or vilified him after being chosen, he should be subject to a fine.[2] None spoke without leave, and all without interruption. It was well understood, too, that it was for the general interest that every voter should attend. As early as 1702 an act was passed ordering town clerks to keep a list of all the freemen in each town, and at every meeting the clerk or a constable was to call the roll. Absentees were to pay a fine of two shillings (collected by a constable and disposed for the use of the town), unless such delinquent could make it appear to the majority of the selectmen that his absence was unavoidable.[3] A large proportion of the people held public office at some time or other, all were employed in promoting the general interests of society, and a general spirit of good neighborhood prevailed among all classes. Thus, to use the words of another: "The little federal republic silently grew until it became the strongest political structure on the continent."[1]

---

[1] "The most noteworthy feature of the Connecticut republic was that it was a federation of independent towns, and that all attributes of sovereignty not expressly granted to the General Court remained, as of original right, in the towns." Fiske's *Beginnings of New England*, 127–128. For opposing views, cf. *The Beginnings of Connecticut Towns*, by Professor Charles M. Andrews, in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, No. 7.

[2] Act of May 1729, in *Colonial Records*, VII. 245.

[3] Act of October 1702, in *Colonial Records*, IV. 398. In the Hartford town records of 1635, appears the following: "It is ordered that there shall be a set meeting of all the townsmen together the first Thursday in every month, by nine of the clock in the forenoon . . . and whosoever of them do not meet at the place and time set, shall forfeit 2s. 6d. for every default."

It will be perceived that, at the dawn of the American Revolution, the exponent of anti-republican principles was bound to be accounted, in Connecticut, little less than a political monstrosity. Any person here at this period who held the opinion that the people were unable to govern themselves, was looked upon with a feeling akin to contempt by his fellow-citizens and treated accordingly. Unfortunately patriotic resentment subsequently led to excesses[2] in sporadic instances and probably caused, in the minds of some, apprehensions as to the outcome of the popular movement. Others became "conservators of peace" solely because they feared the strength and resources of the British realm; they believed that the colonies, already enjoying extensive privileges under her government, were needlessly and futilely seeking a separation. A few professed to be dissatisfied because the General Assembly was more arbitrary than the Parliament itself; while one economically-disposed individual boldly declared that the Continental Congress "ought to be punished for putting the country to so much cost and charge," for he believed "they did no more good than a parcel of squaws."

But it will be found, on due investigation, that Toryism in Connecticut was less secular than sectarian in character; that it was chiefly the outgrowth of jealousies and fears begot by strong religious prejudices. The determined opposition on the part of the people and their representatives (who were mostly Congregationalists) to the introduction into the province of Episcopacy with a foreign prelacy induced the body of the Churchmen to embrace the cause of the Crown, believing that only in the event of success to the British arms could they, as the weaker party, hope for encouragement and permanent religious security—an alternative, in which ecclesiastical principles prevailed over the sentiments of the patriot. Moreover, the score of Episcopal clergymen here were stipendiaries of the English Missionary Society. Hence, unlike many of their brethren at the South,[1] (who generally derived support from those to whom they ministered), they "conceived the measures of the colonies to be unwise, if not unjust, and destined to end either in defeat or ruin on the one hand, or the overthrow of the Church on the other." As faithful "Missionaries" they deemed it a moral obligation, imposed upon them by their oath of allegiance taken at the time of their ordination, to pray for, and give homage to their "Most gracious Sovereign Lord, King George, and the Royal Family." Through frequent observance of this rubrical formula and respect for pastoral injunctions, the laity of the church became, in turn, duly and piously impressed with the divine rights of the King and the sanctity of his royal prerogative. So eminent an advocate and historian of the Church as Dr. Eben Beardsley believes, that "it speaks well for the influence and Christian character of the Episcopal clergy [in Connecticut,] that their congregation so generally sympathized with them in their views both of religious and civil duties;" that "they inculcated upon their members, both from the pulpit and in private conversation, a peaceful submission to the King and to the parent state;" that "they were fearless in avowing and vindicating what they conceived to be not only the essential rights of the British Crown, but the essential interests of their venerated communion;" that, as a consequence, the Churchmen throughout the colony "espoused for the most part the cause of the mother country, and thereby showed themselves loyal subjects of the King." Out of 130 families who attended divine service in his two churches, Rev. Richard Mansfield of Derby reported (December 29, 1775), 110 to be "firm, steadfast friends of the Government," having no sympathy with the popular measures and detesting the "unnatural rebellion."[2]

---

[1] Fiske's *New England*, 128.

[2] In one or two instances some irresponsible persons took the law into their own hands and perpetrated acts not sanctioned by the better class of Whigs. In Simsbury one Tory was shot for being found beyond his own premises—after having been "warned." Another was publicly hanged in Hartford, and the gallows left standing to intimidate other Tories. Phelps, *Newgate of Connecticut*, 28. In Windham, two men, known as "Peters's Spies," who had been arrested for conveying treacherous correspondence, were forced to *run the gauntlet* between two rows of women and children armed with switches and broom-sticks. Larned's *Windham County*, II. 136. For the treatment of the notorious Churchman, Rev. Samuel Peters, cf. *id.*, II. 133–136. Rev. Mr. Leaming, the Episcopal clergyman at Norwalk, was also the victim of a gross outrage at the hands of a "lawless mob." Cf. Beardsley's *History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut*, I. 316 (Boston, 1865).

---

[1] Episcopacy was more firmly established at the South; being supported by the wealthy, the officials of government, army and naval officers, professional men and merchants. There was evidently some laxity of discipline, both clergy and laity opposing for temporary reasons the importation of English bishops. Not being pensioners of the foreign missionary society, the Southern clergy felt more free to share the patriotic sentiments of the people; and some of them, in truth, proved themselves ardent patriots by serving actively in the field. Cf. Perry's *History of the American Episcopal Church, 1587–1883*, I., Chap. XXIV.

[2] Beardsley's *History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut*, I. 306–339. Cf. Davis's *Wallingford and Meriden*, 248. Dr. Beardsley states that "there was just a score of clergymen of the Church of England in Connecticut at the outbreak of hostilities," all but two of whom were natives of the colony.

Judging from the census of 1774 there were in that year twenty-five thousand[1] males in Connecticut between the ages of sixteen and fifty, and of these about two thousand were Tories—most of them in the western part of the state, especially in Fairfield county.[2] This marked localization of Loyalist sentiment west of the Housatonic river has been commonly attributed to "the remoteness of this part of the colony from Boston and its almost exclusive trade with New York."[3] But while this may explain satisfactorily why the distant section did not participate so strongly "in the incipient spirit of the Revolution," it does not adequately account for the prevalence of Toryism *per se;* for which organic social ill some more subtle moral agency will be suspected, and the essential facts are not wanting to prove such suspicion well-grounded.

It was a common apprehension in Connecticut prior to the Revolution that the growth of the English Church was hostile to civil and religious liberty and favorable to the ultimate establishment of a "monarchical government with a legally associated hierarchy." In consequence of this general alarm, a "Convention of Delegates" of Congregational divines from all parts of the colony appointed, at their annual meeting, a committee to investigate the subject. Acting as their agent, the Rev. Elizur Goodrich of Durham made an "accurate and toilsome collection of statistics" relative to the number of Episcopalians in Connecticut and their proportion to Non-Episcopalians. In closing his report,[4] September 5, 1774, Mr. Goodrich makes the Episcopalians about one in thirteen of the total number of inhabitants. But, says Dr. Beardsley, "nowhere in the colony, according to his estimates, was the church so strong as in Fairfield county, where it embraced about *one-third of the people;*"[5] while at Newtown—the hot-bed of Toryism—there was found an equal division ("1084 in either case"). Rev. John Beach, pastor in this latter town and one of the most energetic Loyalists in the state, continued the public exercise of his ministerial functions[1] throughout the war, protesting "that he would do his duty, preach and pray for the King till the Rebels cut out his tongue." He also presided over the church in East Redding, and was instrumental in organizing the famous "Association of Loyalists" at that place. Near the close of the war (October 31, 1781), he penned an exultant epistle to the secretary of the "Home Society" that "Newtown and the Church-of-England part of Redding were, he believed, the only parts of New England that had refused to comply with the doings of Congress."[2] While it is evident, therefore, that of the Loyalists throughout the colony the churchmen of Fairfield county constituted a majority, nevertheless there were some who did not venture to become, like certain of their pastors, conspicuously active in their opposition to popular measures, and they may, perhaps, with some propriety be classed among the so-called "conservators of peace."

---

[1] In *Records of Connecticut Men in the War of the Revolution*, 27,823 different names are indexed, and it is thought that 30,000 may have served. See p. xi.

[2] The principal Loyalist towns were Newtown and Redding. From a "Memorial to the General Council of Safety" (February, 1778), signed by the selectmen of Redding, it appears that 49 Tories in that town had "gone over the enemy;" that 28 Whigs were serving in the Continental Army; and that 112 "able-bodied men" were left. The Churchmen of Newtown were, in 1779, the major part of the population; and the Tories slightly outnumbered the Whigs.

[3] Hinman's *Connecticut in the American Revolution*, 18.

[4] *Minutes of the Convention of Delegates from the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, and Associations of Connecticut, 1766–1775*, p. 62, Appendix, (Hartford, 1843.) After 1763, the English bishops incessantly pressed upon the ministry the adoption of Archbishop Secker's scheme of introducing an Episcopal hierarchy into America, which would have carried with it some of the worst features of the prerogative. Grahame's *History of the United States*, IV. 138.

[5] Beardsley's *History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut*, I. 289.

Patriotic spirit kindled to a blaze in Connecticut in the summer of 1774. Every loyal citizen was filled with indignation over the unjust treatment of his friends in Massachusetts. Special meetings were held in nearly every town, at which resolutions were passed censuring the Boston Port Bill; the timid and ignorant were informed of their rights and grievances; committees of correspondence were appointed, "Sons of Liberty" organized, and "liberty poles" erected throughout the state. Rigorous measures were speedily adopted to search for and crush out the noxious spirit of disaffection. Yet, except in a few aggravated cases, the Tories were at first treated merely as social outlaws. The following resolution of the people of Coventry is a fair sample of most of the others passed at this time: to wit, "We view with grief and detestation those unnatural enemies of our constitution, from amongst ourselves; those vile *anathemas*, who, from motives selfish and servile, to court arbitrary promotion, or servilely to cringe to despotic sway, are affording their aid and assistance to, and co-operating with the ministerial tools of arbitrary power: (they) are unworthy of that friendship and esteem which constitutes the bond of social happiness, and ought to be treated with contempt and total neglect."[1]

---

[1] His brother pastors had discontinued their public prayers by vote of the Convention at New Haven, July 23, 1776.

In concluding his letter of October 31, 1781, Mr. Beach wrote: "I do most heartily thank the Venerable Society for their liberal support, and beg that they will accept this, which is, I believe, my last bill, viz., £325, which, according to former custom, is due." During the war, says Dr. Beardsley, (I. 318), "a generous collection, *by royal order*, was made in England and sent to be distributed among the score of Missionaries in Connecticut." The latter "were not disposed," adds he, (336), "to forfeit their stipends from the English Society . . . while the struggle was still undecided, and the prospects for the colonists so doubtful." "If there were a few instances," says he, (339), "where the flocks were more patriotic than their pastors, the reason for this might be found in the difference of their relations to the Society."

[2] In the autumn of 1775 the selectmen and principal inhabitants of Newtown were prevailed upon to give a bond, with a large pecuniary penalty inserted, not to take up arms against the colonies, as well as not to discourage enlistments into the American forces.

Ridgefield, by vote of her town meeting, December 1774, had also protested against the acts of the Continental Congress. She fell heartily into line the succeeding year, however (December 1775), and appointed her Committee of Inspection, composed of twenty-six members. Rev. Epenetus Townsend was pastor of the English Church in this place; and it is a significant fact that, though many members of his flock were prominent villagers, but one of them is mentioned anywhere in the town or state records as having participated in the patriotic movement, local or otherwise. See list of church members in Teller's *Ridgefield*, 113–127.

It was soon found that resolutions of this kind were likely to prove inadequate. The battle of Lexington had not yet been fought, it is true, but it was deemed expedient, in view of a probable war, to know how each man stood affected: whether his feelings were enlisted in the liberal cause, or whether he secretly disapproved of rebellion against British authority. One of the most effectual preventives of an incipient Toryism at this time, was administered through Committees of Inspection, appointed at town meetings in all parts of the state. These were a body of representative men, fifteen to thirty[2] in number, from each town, who usually met at the court house for the ostensible purpose, it is said, "to take effectual care that the acts of the Continental Congress, held at Philadelphia, September 5, 1774, be absolutely and bona fide adhered to." But it was as a committee of vigilance that their chastening influence was more specifically felt. If any individual fell under the suspicion of the people, (and this was of daily occurrence), "the Committee were immediately notified, and they forthwith repaired to the person and demanded an avowal of his sentiments." They instituted a patriotic and searching espionage into the principles, actions, and private affairs of every member of the community, without regard to station, profession, or character. If one was found to be lukewarm or indifferent, he was closely watched; but, if a royalist in sentiment, he was forbidden to go beyond the limits of his own farm, while in the meantime his name was to be published conspicuously in capital letters on the first page of one or more of the four newspapers of the colony, thus: "PERSONS HELD UP TO PUBLIC VIEW AS ENEMIES TO THEIR COUNTRY, J—— H——;" giving place of residence, etc.[1]

---

[1] The several towns of Litchfield county (February 1775) recommended to the people of their county that "all persons who endeavored by any means or ways to sow the seeds of discord, should be treated with that utter contempt that such criminals justly deserve." Cf. Hinman's *Connecticut*, 51. The people of Lebanon passed similar resolutions, as early as July 18, 1774.

[2] The Committee of Inspection of New London (appointed June 27, 1774) numbered thirty persons, any seven of whom constituted a quorum. Caulkins's *New London*, 503. In Hartford, the Committee had fifteen members. Cf. Trumbull's *Hartford County*, I. 306.

The Committees of Inspection were subsequently recognized by the Governor and Assembly as being most efficient agents for restraining insidious foes. They were not only considered equal in authority to the selectmen and civil officers of the town, but were legally qualified to issue warrants for arrest, etc. In this manner became early established a comprehensive police system, by which the whole state was kept constantly active for the detection of traitors. As the majority[2] of the members of the legislature were themselves Sons of Liberty and town-meeting men, they appreciated fully the necessity of co-operating with the local authorities in their efforts to stamp out this evil; and, in the spring of 1775, committees were appointed to investigate the various cases reported from the towns concerning suspected Tories.[3] In April, the Assembly passed an act recommending to the two hundred parish ministers of the colony, that the cause of liberty be favorably mentioned in their public prayers.[4]

In the fall of the year it was felt that more stringent measures were required: that, as the welfare of the people was jeoparded through the hostile influence of Tories, they, like other criminals, should be debarred from society. The Congress itself (October 6, 1775), advised the several provincial assemblies "to arrest and secure every person, who, going at large, might in their opinion endanger the safety of the colony or liberties of America." Washington held strong views on the subject, and a month later expressed himself to Governor Trumbull, as follows: "Seize the Tories that are active; they are preying on the vitals of the country and will do all the mischief in their power."[1] That the governor was of the same opinion is evidenced in a letter written shortly afterward to his son Joseph, wherein he says: "It is of the utmost importance to secure the malignants in every colony, to prevent our enemy gaining any footing on the continent, or receiving supplies, assistance, or intelligence. Let us show a determination to enjoy liberty and freedom while we live, and not suffer hypocritical friends, who seek our ruin, to wheedle and cajole us."[2]

---

[1] The four newspapers of the Revolutionary epoch, all strongly patriotic in sentiment, were the *Connecticut Gazette* of New London, the *Connecticut Courant* of Hartford, the *Connecticut Journal* of New Haven, and the *Norwich Packet.*

[2] Col. Storrs, a member from the eastern section of the state, writes in his "Diary," April 27, 1775,—"Bad weather for Tories in the House; yet we have some." Larned's *Windham County*, II. 148.

[3] A "Memorial" from Waterbury showed, that the "major part" of a militia company of that town were thought to be "inimical;" and the "*true Whigs*" prayed to be annexed to a new company. A committee of two was at once appointed to examine into the case and report at the next Assembly. Act of April 1775, in *Colonial Records*, XIV. 43.

[4] *Colonial Records*, XIV. 434. At a parish meeting in New London it was put to vote, that no person be permitted to enter the church and act as pastor to it, *unless* he openly prays for Congress and the free and independent States of America, and their prosperity by sea and land. Caulkins's *New London*, 447.

Both branches of the legislature were *en rapport* with the governor and Congress on this point, and at the special session held at Hartford, December 14, 1775, passed an act entitled, "an act for restraining and punishing persons inimical to the liberties of this and other of the united colonies." In order that the punishment should fit the crime, the Loyalists were divided into the following three general classes:

1. Those who directly or indirectly supplied the enemy with provisions or military stores; or gave or conveyed intelligence to the enemy; or enlisted, procured or persuaded others to enlist, in the service of the enemy; or took up arms against the colonies; or undertook to pilot any vessel of the enemy; or knowingly and willingly aided the enemy in any other way whatsoever;

2. Those who by writing or speaking, or by any overt act, defamed the resolves of Congress, or the acts or proceedings of the Assembly respecting their rights and privileges;

3. Those reported to the local authorities as "inimical."

The Loyalist of the first class was to forfeit his estate, and to be imprisoned, the term not exceeding three years. He of the second class was to be disfranchised, could keep no arms, and serve in no civil or military capacity; and, if thought necessary, he was to be imprisoned or fined, and to find surety of the peace as the court might order, and pay cost of prosecution. He of the third class must appear before the selectmen or Committee of Inspection of his town, by whom he would be disarmed until such time as he could prove his friendliness to the liberal cause; and if he refused to be disarmed, the civil authorities could order the sheriff to call out the county militia for assistance. It was further enacted that, on information being made to the county court by the selectmen of any town that there were real estates in such town owned by any Loyalist of the first class, the said court should issue warrants and attach the property and place it in the care of some proper person to improve it for the use of the colony, and account to the latter for the rents. The state treasurer was empowered to make sale of all such lands, either at public vendue or by private sale, as he judged would conduce most to the benefit of the colony, and to execute deeds accordingly.[1]

---

[1] Washington to Trumbull (November 1775), in Stuart's *Life of Trumbull*, 220. Cf. Washington to Trumbull (January 7, 1776), in Ford's *Washington*, III. 324.

[2] For similar sentiments, see Deane to the Committee of Secret Correspondence (October 1, 1776), in Wharton's *Diplomatic Correspondence of the Revolution*, II. 160.

Early in the ensuing year (January 2, 1776) Congress again recommended "the most speedy and effectual measures to frustrate the mischievous machinations and restrain the wicked practices of these men;" that "they ought to be disarmed, the dangerous kept in safe custody, or bound with sureties for good behavior." Connecticut had already lived fully up to this doctrine; nevertheless complaints began to come in from the various towns, concerning the misdeeds of Tories who were still left at large.[2] The governor and council were not deaf to these memorials and, at the regular session held at Hartford June 14, 1776, it was enacted that the goods of every "inimical" person should be seized and sold for the benefit of the colony; also, that he who owed such a person money, should be factorized by the selectmen for the benefit of the colony; *i. e.*, the debtor was to pay the selectmen, who would be compensated for their trouble and hand over to the state treasurer the various sums collected. If any individual said that he was not satisfied that the colony was justified in these measures, a committee was at once appointed to investigate his case, and if upon examination he proved to be "inimical," he was treated accordingly.

The patriot nerve-of-distrust had now become morbidly sensitive, mere whisperings of Loyalist intrigue exciting general apprehension. No slight commotion ensued at Hartford, therefore, when it was learned that the negro-governor Cuff (who had held his position for ten years) had recently resigned his high office, and, without waiting a general election, appointed as his successor John Anderson—a black servitor of the elder Skene, governor of Crown Point and Ticonderoga. This latter prominent official had been arrested in June 1775, at Philadelphia, as a Loyalist, and sent by Congress to Connecticut, where, for the past year, he had resided with his family at West Hartford, a prisoner-at-large, under parole. It was feared that Governor Skene had, himself, manipulated the political wires, securing this appointment of his servant in order to gain personal influence over the blacks of the colony with reference to some future hostile movement. Governor Trumbull and the Council of Safety at once took the matter into solemn consideration and appointed a committee of investigation, who, in turn, invoked constabulary aid. After a careful examination of Governor Skene's private papers, and taking the testimony of several witnesses, Hon. Jesse Root, chairman of the committee, submitted to the General Council (May 22, 1776) an elaborate and detailed report, to the effect, that Ex-Governor Cuff had been advised by some of his colored friends to resign in favor of Anderson; that Governor Skene had given his servant a half-joe "to keep election;" that the latter had, himself, expended the sum of £25 in treating his would-be subjects; and that two British officers had contributed fifty shillings toward defraying the expenses of a dance and entertainment. It was apparent to the Council that nothing of a very dangerous tendency had been discovered, and that the whole affair was, probably, merely a compliment to the liberal New York negro from his admiring, but less affluent Connecticut brethren. The excitement attending this interesting though somewhat irregular election seems to have shortly blown over, and it is supposed that the new governor subsequently performed the duties of his office to the satisfaction of all concerned.[1]

---

[1] *Colonial Records*, XV.; and Hinman's *Connecticut*, 195–196.

[2] The following extract is taken from the *Connecticut Courant*, of May 20, 1776. "A gang of Tories has been discovered in the neighborhood of Fairfield, taken and imprisoned. . . . . If these internal enemies are suffered to proceed in their hellish schemes, our ruin is certain; but if they are destroyed, the power of Hell and Britain will never prevail against us. Rouse then, my countrymen, search out the nest of these vultures, and bring them to the punishment they merit."

Three months after independence was declared by Congress, Connecticut became a state of the Union, when her legislature made the following characteristic announcement: "This Republic is, and shall forever be and remain, a free, sovereign and independent State, by the name of Connecticut." Henceforth (in accordance with an act passed by the Assembly, October 1776) any Loyalist of the first class found within her borders, would be convicted of high treason, and sentenced to death. At the same session it was further enacted, that if any one shall have knowledge of any persons endeavoring to join, or endeavoring to persuade or induce others to join, aid, comfort, or assist the enemy in any way whatsoever, *and shall conceal the fact*, "he shall be punished by fine, and imprisoned at the judgment of the Superior Court, in any gaols of the State, not exceeding three years."[1]

---

[1] Cf. Trumbull's *Hartford County*, I. 305, and Hinman's *Connecticut in the American Revolution*, 31–33. See also *Virginia Gazette*, July 8, 1775.

Governor Cuff tendered his resignation at Hartford, May 11, 1776. The following is his farewell address: "I Governor Cuff of the Negro's in the province of Connecticut do Resine my Governmentshipe, to John Anderson Niegor Man to Governor Skene. And I hope that you will obeye him as you have Done me for this ten years' past. when Col. Willis' Niegor Dayed I was the next. But being weak and unfit for that office do Resine the said Governmentshipe to John Anderson."

The governor-elect accepted his appointment in the following terms:

"I, John Anderson, having the Honour to be appointed Governor over you I will do my utmost endevere to serve you in Every Respect, and I hope you will obey me accordingly.

John Anderson, Governor over the Niegors in Connecticut."

"Pomp Willis," "John Jones," "Fraday," and others, were "Witnesses present."

It will be seen that it served the personal interest and safety of every citizen at this period to become an informer. That few failed to act as such is shown in the number and character of the memorials that came in to the Assembly from nearly every town in the state. The people of the shore-towns, especially, were loud in their complaints of Loyalists, who would cross to Long Island and return in considerable parties to prey upon their respective communities.[2] To repress this evil, the Assembly resolved that "no person in a sea-port town, should under any pretense depart from any port, harbor, bay, creek, river, or other place in the State, in any boat, skiff, canoe, etc., without a written license from one of the selectmen of the town from which he should depart;" and the various small craft were all to be drawn up in some convenient locality.

The following spring (May 8, 1777) an act still more extensive in scope was passed, which decreed that no person should pass from town to town (except well-known friendly people and military men), without a written permit signed either by a justice of the peace, army officer, selectman or committee of inspection, certifying where the bearer was going, where he came from, and reputing him to be friendly. Every suspect was seized and examined, and, if without such a permit, was arrested with or without a warrant and brought to trial before a justice of the peace, when, if found guilty, he or she was bound over on good behavior, or committed to jail until delivered by process of law. All were to aid in capturing such persons, or render themselves liable to a fine; and to prevent any evasion of the law, night watches were kept in nearly every town in the state, by which all the chief roads and passes were strictly guarded.

---

[1] *Public Records of Connecticut* (1776–8), I. 4. Mr. R. H. Phelps, in his *Newgate of Connecticut*, 40–41, relates the following incident of Rev. Roger Viets, Episcopal pastor at Simsbury: "At midnight some men, who, it afterwards appeared, were eluding pursuit, called at his house and asked for charitable aid. Lodging he dare not give them. Food he could not refuse. The authorities heard of it, became suspicious, and he was accused. He did not deny the charge. He was fined, and condemned to imprisonment in Hartford jail." But, according to the *State Records*, Mr. Viets was afterwards released on parole; and he is said to have preached Toryism to the Newgate prisoners. Another Loyalist minister, Simon Baxter, also preached ardent sermons at the Newgate mines. Cf. Bew's *History of Connecticut*, 175.

[2] "A sloop captured (bound to New York); carried to Fairfield, with several Tory passengers and committed to gaol. Three other vessels captured with 13 absconding Tories on board." *Connecticut Courant*, June 6, 1777.

At this same session (May 1777) the legislature passed an Act enjoining it upon all freemen to take the "Oath of Fidelity," and prescribing its form.[1] No person in Connecticut could hereafter exercise any office, civil or military, or vote in any town, society or other public meeting legally appointed, or plead in any court (except his own case), until he had taken this oath in open freemen's meeting in his own town, administered by a justice of the peace, town clerk or the selectmen; and the names of all freemen were to be enrolled. Furthermore, it was enacted (October 1777) that no inhabitant of the state, or the United States, who was "inimical," *or who neglected or refused to take the oath of fidelity*, could hold, purchase or transfer real estate in Connecticut, without special license from the General Assembly; any other conveyance to be null and void.[2]

It was practically impossible in Connecticut for any Loyalist literature to obtrude itself before the public eye. In August 1777, it was reported that a pamphlet, entitled *A Discourse upon Extortion*, which contained insulting reflections on civil government, was in the press at Hartford. As it was soon to be printed and scattered among the people, the Assembly ordered a warrant, directing the sheriff of Hartford County to seize said pamphlet and all copies thereof and deliver them to the state attorney, who was to inspect them and pursue advisable measures.

To dwell further upon legislative enactments of this character, would be supererogatory. It must be observed from those already cited, that that man was indeed a clever dissembler[3] who could entertain views inimical to the American cause and escape the wrath of the Connecticut freemen. In the western part of the state, where the Tories were of greater number, they at first attempted some mischief; but, upon receipt of memorials from several of the towns, the Assembly at their October session, in 1776, appointed a committee to repair to that section and "arrest all inimical persons and send them under proper guard to a place of safety." This was subsequently done, and many were taken captive and confined in the various towns of the interior.[1]

---

[1] "You, A—— B——, being by the providence of God an inhabitant of this State of Connecticut, do swear by the name of the ever-living God, that you will be true and faithful to the Governor and Company of this State, and the constitution and government thereof as a free and independent State: and whensoever you shall be called to give your vote or suffrage touching any matter which concerns this State, you shall give it as in your conscience you shall judge will conduce to the best good of the same, without respect of persons or favor of any man: So help you God." *Public Records of Connecticut* (1776-8), I. 227.

[2] *Public Records of Connecticut* (1776-8), I. 227.

[3] A most remarkable case of a "clever dissembler" (recently brought to light) is that of an Irish emigrant, "Squire" William Heron of Redding; who served in the Connecticut legislature during the war and at its close returned to his extensive farm and lived highly respected among his townsmen until his death. See Todd's *Redding*, 198. But, from "A Record of Private Intelligence" (January-July, 1781) kept by Sir Henry Clinton, it appears that the British chief employed and paid Heron as a trusted spy. Cf. *Mag. Amer. Hist.*, X. 503 and XI. 62. It would seem, however, that Heron was a double-dyed traitor, and enriched himself by serving as a spy for both sides, often bringing secret intelligence to Gen. Parsons and others. Cf. "An Examination of the Charge of Treason against Gen. S. H. Parsons," read before the Connecticut Historical Society, March 5, 1896, by Joseph G. Woodward; published in the *Year-Book* (1895-6) *of the Connecticut Sons of the American Revolution*, 188-210.

Tory prisoners were incarcerated in nearly every gaol[2] in the colony; the yards of which, in many instances, were enclosed with high fences to ensure greater security. So thorough was the prison discipline, and so carefully were the inmates guarded, that few attempted to make an escape. Massachusetts, New York and New Jersey each requested the privilege of sending Tory captives here; and, in the summer of 1776, they began to arrive in large numbers (especially from New York).[3] Some of them were the most influential of their class in their respective states: among others being Governor Franklin[4] of New Jersey, Mayor Matthews of New York City, and Dr. Benjamin Church of Watertown, Massachusetts. This latter gentleman had been appointed Director of Hospitals for the East; but, being detected afterwards in treacherous correspondence with the British at Boston, he was arrested by Washington, under a resolve of Congress, and sent to Connecticut. He was confined at Norwich (November 1775), "without pen, ink, or paper, and not allowed to converse except in English and in presence of a magistrate or sheriff;" but, by an act of the Assembly (March 22, 1776), he was allowed to go out of prison (not beyond the parish limits), once a week, under a proper puard. Governor Franklin was first immured in the old gaol at Wallingford; but at the request of the citizens of that town, was afterward (fall of 1776) removed to Middletown, and finally to East Windsor. In January (1777) he asked permission of the governor and council to go home on parole, as many others were doing, promising to give bonds in surety for good behavior; but, owing to the extremity of the situation in New Jersey at that time, he was not allowed and was so informed, upon which he waxed wroth and subsequently wrote many public complaints.

---

[1] "A few days ago a number of Tories from New Milford and other places, were committed to gaol in Hartford." *Connecticut Courant,* May 9, 1777.

[2] The principal gaols were at Canaan, Salisbury, Sharon, Litchfield, Farmington, Norwich, New London, East Haddam, Preston, Hartford, Durham, Glastonbury, Middletown, Wallingford, Saybrook, Windham, Colchester, and the famous Newgate copper mines at Simsbury, where, in the summer of 1776, the Tory captives were between thirty and forty in number.

[3] The following extracts from the *Connecticut Courant* indicate the great number of New York Loyalists that must have been imprisoned here during that year: "On Friday last (28 June, 1776), 49 Tories, taken at Johnstown, N. Y., were brought under guard from Albany to Hartford, and others were on the way."

Aug. 12, 1776. "Last week from 20 to 30 Tories arrived in Hartford from Albany, 15 of whom were to be stationed at New London."

Aug. 23, 1776. "Three vessels arrived in New London in one week from New York, with Tories collected in New York City and Long Island, who were sent into the country towns for safety."

[4] "Gov. Franklin of New Jersey is on his way to Gov. Trumbull at Lebanon. He is a noted Tory and ministerial tool. . . . . His principles, connexions, abilities and address, have rendered him a dangerous enemy to New Jersey: he is therefore removed under a strong guard to Connecticut." *Connecticut Courant,* July 4, 1776.

The rigorous guard kept over Dr. Church and Governor Franklin was doubtless a policy both prudent and proper, since their hostile influence, if not limited in this wise, would have resulted in downright injury to the American cause. The ascription of Dr. Peters, that the Connecticut patriots were a "Puritan mob-ility," is the portraiture of a people drawn by an unfriendly hand. Whenever leniency could be shown to a Tory captive, without endangering the success of the patriot cause, it was done. In July 1776, by order of the commissary of prisoners, many were given liberty under parole to walk two miles from gaol, but were not allowed to go outside of the parish where they were stationed except by a written permit. They could occasionally send or receive letters, which were first read by the civil authorities. In August 1776, the sheriff of New London county was directed by the legislature, "to suffer the New York prisoners at Norwich to take the air one or two days each week for their health, under the sheriff's personal attendance; and to walk in the gaol-yard in the daytime, at his discretion." If in ill health, they were generally removed to a more healthful locality. Liberty was often granted, too, at this time (August 1776), for Tory prisoners to go to their homes (properly guarded) to get necessary clothing, provided they bore the expense of the journey. They were also to sign a parole of honor "not to act, do or say anything to obstruct or contravene the measures adopted by the American States to preserve freedom."

As early as the autumn of 1774—immediately after the town meetings had appointed committees of inspection and adopted resolutions of "contempt and neglect"—a few of the more sensitive of the "friends to government," who desired the respect and esteem of their neighbors, hastened to retract[1] previous utterances, and, upon

---

[1] The confessions of 25 Tories were accepted in one day at New Milford (November 27, 1775) by the Committee of Inspection of that village. Cf. Hinman, 574.

The speech and conduct of John Stevens, the proprietor of extensive plantations in Ashford, subjected him to suspicion, as well as to an inquisitorial visitation from his taking a solemn pledge to stand steadfast for the liberties of the people, were welcomed back into the good graces of their fellow citizens. Throughout the next two years many "inimicals" of the "second class," who had been imprisoned, were released, after having signed a full and ample declaration of the justice of the American cause, with professions of their friendship to it, and their readiness to take up arms in its defense.

It was not, however, until the summer of the following year (1777), that the Loyalists began to repent in a body and were admitted into the patriotic fold; those of the "first class" being comprehended, who had been confined and their estates confiscated, and others who had fled to the enemy. This remarkable conversion was owing principally to the following liberal act, passed by this Assembly in May, 1777. "Whereas, sundry of the inhabitants of this State, some from ill advice, others from inadvertence and mistaken apprehensions, have absconded and put themselves under the protection of the enemies of this and other States of America, but are now supposed to be convinced of their error and would probably return to their duty, had they assurance of protection, Therefore be it resolved," etc. The governor issued a proclamation assuring pardon of all treason, or misprision of treason, to those who (before August 1, 1777) appeared in Connecticut before a justice of the peace and took the oath of allegiance, and broke off all communication with the enemy, etc. Such persons should also be freed from prosecution for their offences.[1]

The following case of John McKee of Norwalk is a fair illustration of the manner in which Connecticut treated scores of Loyalists at this time, who honestly desired to be restored to their former status as freemen of the state and receive the protection of her laws. In June 1776, McKee had been convicted of harboring and secreting some persons who were about to join the enemy. He had been sentenced to one year's imprisonment, and to forfeit his estate. At the expiration of the year (June 1777), he said that he was convinced of the iniquity of his conduct; was now heartily disposed to serve the American cause; and prayed that he be released and his estate restored. It was resolved by the legislature "that he return to his family and improve his forfeited estate during the pleasure of

neighbors, which resulted in the subjoined declaration, August 5, 1774. "As I, the subscriber, have talked at sundry times against the chartered rights of the colonies, I do humbly ask their forgiveness. And I further declare that I never will talk or act anything against the Sons of Liberty, but do solemnly swear that I am a true Son of Liberty, and will remain so during my natural life. In witness whereof I set my hand. John Stevens." Larned's *Windham County*, II. 130.

[1] *Public Records*, I. 254.

the Assembly, on paying such cost as may have accrued since his confinement."[1]

Ere the close of the war hundreds of Connecticut Loyalists had voluntarily made public recantations of past errors; had taken the freemen's oath in open town-meeting; and, after the payment of certain costs, the whole or a part of their forfeited estates had been restored. Some, who had early left the colony and remained active in the British service throughout, were never pardoned. Nor was this through any fault or severity of the General Assembly; for as late as May 1779, "believing that many who had fled to the enemy, were convinced of their folly, and desired to be restored to the favor of their country," they passed a second liberal act, extending the same privileges to "absconding Tories" as had been done two years previously. But in this instance, before the governor issued the proclamation of pardon, many of these Loyalists had joined and accompanied Gen. Tryon in his infamous raid upon the defenceless shore-towns; in consequence of which the Assembly and Council of Safety subsequently voted (August 1779) not to issue the proclamation.[2]

The wives and children of this class, however, were treated humanely and generously; the former, whenever it was desired, being aided to join their husbands. If this was impracticable, the children (if any) were bound out to some respectable family in the neighborhood. In some cases, where the lands had been forfeited and the goods seized by the selectmen, the widow had one-third of the husband's personal property restored to her, and was granted the use of one-third of his real estate; *i. e.*, "to have and enjoy" during the pleasure of the General Assembly.[3]

In various towns in the southern and western section of the state town-meetings were held by citizens in the latter days of the war, and the question put to vote whether any person should be allowed to return and dwell in their midst who was previously an inhabitant of the town, but had gone over to and assisted the enemy in arms against them. This question was invariably resolved in the negative, unless such person should first obtain general permission to return. Few (especially of those who had been engaged with Tryon) ever obtained this permission,[4] and the majority, having lost both their credit and their property at home, eventually found an asylum in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. In after years some of these fugitives acknowledged and grievously lamented their mistake in having thus sided against their countrymen in the patriotic struggle for liberty.[1]

---

[1] *Public Records*, I. 30. The following is an example of the many resolutions of the Connecticut Council of Safety. "June 13, 1777. George Follick, of Ridgefield, who was committed to the gaol in Hartford, as a Tory, shall be liberated from said prison, by paying all the costs and taking the oath of fidelity."

[2] *Public Records*, II. 279 and 386.

[3] See the case of Mary Hoyt of Danbury in *Public Records*, I. 299.

[4] Cf. Hurd's *Fairfield County*, 640, for a similar vote at Ridgefield, August 9, 1779. Tories of Ridgefield, who had harbored the British on the occasion of Tryon's raid

It has been seen that this province was thoroughly competent to deal with internal foes; that, while bloody scenes were enacted between Whig and Tory just over her border in the "Neutral Ground," she was enabled to prevent even the symptoms of a civil war. Though her attitude toward the Loyalists was firm and decided, it was not vindictive or revengeful. An examination of town and state records clearly evidences the fact that the governor and Assembly (and generally the freemen, too) were ready and willing to pardon the guilty and to accept repentance. As a result of this generosity hundreds of that unfortunate class retracted their hostile expressions and became loyal citizens, who otherwise would have remained hostile to the end.

G. A. GILBERT.

---

to Danbury, were taken by the indignant citizens to the river late at night, and treated to a prolonged "ducking."

[1] Munson Jarvis, a prominent Loyalist of Stamford, wrote from St. John, N. B., (July 3, 1788), to Rev. Samuel Peters in London: "I have made one great mistake in politics, for which reason I never intend to make so great a blunder again." *Genealogy of Jarvis Family*, 29. For a curious "Confiscation Deed of Property," see *ibid.*, p. 281.

THE POLITICS OF JOHN ADAMS

At the age of twenty-three John Adams wrote in his diary the following words: "Aim at an exact knowledge of the nature, end and means of government. Compare the different forms of it with each other and each of them with their effects on public and private happiness." This programme he carried out. To the end of his life "no romance was more entertaining" than politics. They were to him the "divine science, the grandest, the noblest, the most useful . . . in the whole circle" of sciences; and his study of them was characterized by breadth and depth as well as zeal. The principles of government, so he wrote his kinsman, Samuel Adams, are to be found by the observation and study of "human nature, society and universal history." He acquainted himself thoroughly with the political theories of the great writers, ancient and modern—the works of Lord Bolingbroke, for example, he read through more than five times although, in his opinion, the author was "a haughty, arrogant, supercilious dogmatist;" but he owed far more to the direct study of "human nature, society and universal history" than to the conclusions of the philosophers. As a rule he quotes to refute; and his work presents in every part unmistakable signs of an original, independent, and profound thinker.

Public events soon gave to these studies a fresh impulse and at the same time a practical turn. Two years after the entry given above, John Adams listened to the plea of James Otis against the Writs of Assistance. It was an event of profound significance to colonial America and indeed to the British empire. "Otis's oration against writs of assistance," wrote John Adams long afterwards, "breathed into this nation the breath of life . . . American Independence was then and there born; the seeds of patriots and heroes were then and there sown . . . Every man of a crowded audience appeared to me to go away, as I did, ready to take up arms against writs of assistance. Then and there was the first scene of the first act of opposition to the arbitrary claims of Great Britain."[1]

One result of the plea of Otis was to direct attention to the question of the rights of the colonists. It was a time when the doctrine of natural rights was beginning to work its way into general favor; there was, indeed, considerable risk that it might become in America, as later in France, the basis of popular resistance to governmental oppression. The validity of this doctrine when reasonably interpreted and applied, is well established; but in practical use it is dangerous and greatly demoralizing. Indeed, it can hardly be doubted that if resistance to the oppressive policy of Great Britain had rested solely or mainly on the doctrine of natural rights, it must soon have degenerated into mob violence, and could not have developed into a successful revolution.

---

[1] *Life and Works*, X. 362.

At this time John Adams was a young lawyer with an abundance of time for reading and thought. He was a graduate of Harvard, had taught school and studied law at Worcester, had enjoyed intercourse with a number of stimulating men; and, for his years, had read and re-read a phenomenal number of good books. His letters and diary show that he had made great progress in self-acquaintance; that his aims were of the highest; that he revered the truth; and that he criticized himself with unsparing severity. The important historic events of his early manhood were the Seven Years' War and the philosophical movement in Europe; and these had helped to confirm in him the disposition to take broad views and to trace things to their sources.

In the year 1765, with the solid equipment just described, John Adams, at the age of thirty, entered the service of his country. He wrote in August a series of articles, four in number, for the *Boston Gazette*, which were reproduced in the *London Chronicle*, and later were published together under the title, *A Dissertation on the Canon and Feudal Law*. The *Dissertation* began with a statement of the views of the writer upon the relation of the Stamp Act to general history, to the history of the colonies, and to their higher interests, civil, religious, and intellectual; it closed with advice as to the means proper for meeting the emergency created by the adoption of the policy embodied in this act. This production did much to prepare the people for the critical times that were just ahead; it discloses at the outset of his long career of patriotic service, the very heart and mind of the author. Our immediate interest, however, is to learn what it tells of his system of politics.

The *Dissertation* opens with the inquiry, What is the source of oppression? This is found in that "noble principle" of human nature which is also the source of freedom, namely, "the love of power." This principle has always prompted the great of the earth to free themselves from every limitation to their power, "has stimulated the common people to aspire at independency, and to confine the power of the great within the limits of equity and reason." In this struggle the poor people have usually failed, because, owing to their ignorance, "they have seldom been able to frame and support a regular opposition." The great have taken advantage of this, and have labored "in all ages, to wrest from the populace . . . the knowledge of their rights and wrongs, and the power to assert the former or redress the latter. I say *Rights* for such they have . . . antecedent to all earthly government, *Rights* that cannot be repealed or restrained by human laws—*Rights* derived from the Great Legislator of the Universe."

In these early paragraphs appear certain views that lie at the foundation of the politics of John Adams. The first is that slavery and freedom proceed from one and the same principle in human nature, namely the love of power; later in the *Discourses on Davila*, the more comprehensive phrase, 'thirst for distinction" is substituted for "love of power"; but the change does not imply any departure from the original idea. A second view of the utmost importance to the comprehension of the system, is that this love of power is an "aspiring, noble principle, founded in benevolence." From this it follows that the aim of a wise public policy must be not to extirpate "the love of power" in the human heart, but so to direct and regulate its operation that it shall issue in freedom. It is certainly one of the noblest characteristics of John Adams that he felt habitually a profound reverence for human nature, and finds in the primary passions of man the proofs of divine wisdom. A third idea is that the common people have rights which are indefeasible. What these are he does not tell us here. But elsewhere he makes it evident that they include the right to equality with the great in the legal protection of person and property, the right to equal participation in law-making, the right of veto upon unfriendly legislation, and the right to education at the public expense.

The second portion of the *Dissertation* is historical. The canon and feudal law were invented by the great for their own advantage. In the canon law we have "the most refined, sublime, extensive and astonishing constitution of policy that was ever conceived by the mind of man," and the Romish clergy framed it "for the aggrandisement of their own order." The feudal law was formed for the same purposes as the canon law: it held the common people "in a state of servile dependence" and "of total ignorance of every thing divine and human excepting the use of arms and the culture of their lands." Then the supporters of these two systems made a "wicked confederacy," and 'one age of darkness succeeded another, till God in his benign providence, raised up the champions who began and conducted the Reformation." At that time knowledge began to spread "in Europe, but especially in England," and as it spread,

"the people grew more and more sensible of the wrong that was done them by these systems. . . . till at last under the execrable race of the Stuarts, the struggle between the people and the confederacy aforesaid of temporal and spiritual tyranny, became formidable, violent and bloody. It was this great struggle that peopled America. It was not religion alone, as is commonly supposed; but it was a love of universal liberty, and a hatred, a dread, a horror of the infernal confederacy before described, that projected, conducted and accomplished the settlement of America. It was a resolution formed by a sensible people—I mean the Puritans—almost in despair. . . . After their arrival here, they . . . formed their plan, both of ecclesiastical and civil government, in direct opposition to the canon and feudal systems. . . . Whatever imperfections may be justly ascribed to them, which, however, are as few as any mortals have discovered, their judgment in framing their policy was founded in wise, humane and benevolent principles. It was founded in revelation and in reason too. It was consistent with the principles of the best and greatest and wisest legislators of antiquity. Tyranny in every form, shape and appearance was their disdain and abhorrence. . . . They were very far from being enemies to monarchy; and they knew as well as any men the just regard and honor that is due to the character of a dispenser of the mysteries of the gospel of grace. But they saw clearly that popular powers must be placed as a guard, a control, a balance, to the powers of the monarch and the priest, in every government. Their greatest concern seems to have been to establish a government of the church more consistent with the Scriptures, and a government of the state more agreeable to the dignity of human nature. . . . They knew that government was a plain, simple, intelligible thing, founded in nature and reason, and quite comprehensible by common sense. . . . They were convinced by their knowledge of human nature, derived from history and their own experience, that nothing could preserve their posterity from the encroachments of the two systems of tyranny . . . but knowledge diffused generally through the whole body of the people. . . . For this purpose they laid very early the foundations of colleges. . . . But the wisdom and benevolence of our fathers rested not here. They made an early provision by law that every town consisting of so many families, should be always furnished with a grammar school. They made it a crime for such a town to be destitute of a grammar schoolmaster for a few months, and subjected it to a heavy penalty. So that the education of all ranks of people was made the care and expense of the public, in a manner that I believe has been unknown to any other people, ancient or modern. . . . The consequences of these establishments we see and feel every day. A native of America who cannot read and write is as rare an appearance as a Jacobite or a Roman Catholic, that is, as rare as a comet or an earthquake. It has been observed that we are all of us lawyers, divines, politicians and philosophers." [1]

For our purpose it is not the accuracy and justice of the account in which the writer describes the rise of the canon and feudal law, that chiefly concern us; what we care to note is the conception of the significance as an event in the history of the world, of the planting and peculiar development of the Puritan colonies in America. To their founders he ascribes the loftiest aims; in their devotion, steadfastness of purpose, unfailing courage, and eminently practical wisdom he sees the noblest spiritual traits; and in their achievements the highest form and furthest advance of human progress. The mission of the new world has dawned upon him in all its grandeur: "I always consider the settlement of America with reverence and wonder, as the opening of a grand scene and design in Providence for the illumination of the ignorant, and the emancipation of the slavish part of mankind all over the earth."[2]

The Stamp Act proves the existence of "a design to enslave all America." How shall we baffle this design? Only by imitating the example of those who founded the colonies; like them we must "diffuse knowledge generally through the whole body of the people." For

> "liberty cannot be preserved without a general knowledge among the people, who have a right, from the frame of their nature, to knowledge, as their great Creator, who does nothing in vain, has given them understandings, and a desire to know; but besides this they have a right, an indisputable, unalienable, indefeasible, divine right to that most dreaded and envied kind of knowledge, I mean of the characters and conduct of their rulers. Rulers are no more than attorneys, agents, and trustees, for the people; and if the cause, the interest and trust, is insidiously betrayed, or wantonly trifled away, the people have a right to revoke the authority that they themselves have deputed, and to constitute abler and better agents, attorneys and trustees. And the preservation of the means of knowledge among the lowest ranks, is of more importance to the public than all the property of all the rich men in the country. It is even of more consequence to the rich themselves, and to their posterity."

Without knowledge the spirit of liberty

> "would be little better than a brutal rage. Let us tenderly and kindly cherish, therefore, the means of knowledge. Let us dare to read, think, speak, and write . . . . Let all become attentive to the grounds and principles of government, ecclesiastical and civil. Let

---

[1] *Works*, III. 449–456.

[2] *Works*, III. 452.

us study the law of nature; search into the spirit of the British constitution; read the histories of ancient ages; contemplate the great examples of Greece and Rome; set before us the conduct of our own British ancestors, who have defended for us the inherent rights of mankind against foreign and domestic tyrants and usurpers, against arbitrary kings and cruel priests . . . . Let us read and recollect and impress upon our souls the views and ends of our own more immediate forefathers, in exchanging their native country for a dreary, inhospitable wilderness. Let us examine into the nature of that power, and the cruelty of that oppression, which drove them from their homes . . . . Let us recollect it was liberty, the hope of liberty for themselves and us and ours, which conquered all discouragements, dangers, and trials . . . . Let the pulpit resound with the doctrines and sentiments of religious liberty . . . . Let the bar proclaim, 'the laws, the rights, the generous plan of power' delivered down from remote antiquity, inform the world of the mighty struggles and numberless sacrifices made by our ancestors in defence of freedom . . . . Let them search for the foundations of British laws and government in the frame of human nature, in the constitution of the intellectual world. There let us see that truth, liberty, justice, and benevolence, are its everlasting basis . . . . Let the public disputations (in the Colleges) become researches into the grounds and nature and ends of government, and the means of preserving the good and demolishing the evil."[1]

This prologue, which reveals the character as well as the political principles of John Adams, furnishes the key to his career. The attitude here taken is that of a statesman who studies public questions in their largest aspects, who asks how they relate themselves to the past, to the future and to those interests of the people which concern character and destiny; and this attitude he maintains to the end.

The first period in the public career of John Adams covers the years from the Stamp Act to the first Continental Congress, 1765 to 1774. In September of the year first named he wrote the *Instructions* of the town of Braintree to its representatives in the General Court. In these he set forth in clear terms that theory of nullification which has played so great a part in American constitutional history. The Stamp Act violated—so the writer held—fundamental constitutional rights, rights well-defined, long enjoyed and essential to the welfare of the people. He declared the Stamp Act unconstitutional because

"we have always understood it to be a grand and fundamental principle of the constitution, that no freeman should be subject to any tax to which he has not given his own consent in person or by proxy. And the maxims of the law, as we have constantly received them, are to the same effect, that no freeman can be separated from his property but by his own act or fault. We take it clearly, therefore, to be inconsistent with the spirit of the common law, and of the essential fundamental principles of the British constitution, that we should be subject to any tax imposed by the British Parliament; because we are not represented in that assembly in any sense, unless it be by a fiction of law, as insensible in theory as it would be injurious in practice, if such a taxation should be grounded on it."

---

[1] III. 462–463.

But if these remonstrances should not be heeded: . . . "We further recommend the most clear and explicit assertion and vindication of our rights and liberties to be entered on the public records, that the world may know, in the present and all future generations, that we have a clear knowledge and a just sense of them, and, with submission to Divine Providence, that we never can be slaves."[1]

That these instructions adequately expressed the convictions of his fellow-citizens was soon made evident; forty towns in addition to Braintree accepted them as their own, and Samuel Adams incorporated some of the stronger passages in the instructions which he drew up for Boston.

This work of political education was carried on, not, however, without considerable interruptions, throughout the period of resistance. One of the most important services in this line was a number of articles signed *Novanglus* in reply to a series written by the loyalist, Daniel Leonard, over the signature *Massachusettensis.* Leonard's arguments had made a deep impression; to remove this John Adams, who found on his return from Congress "in the month of November, 1774 . . . the *Massachusetts Gazette* teeming with political speculations, and Massachusettensis shining like the moon among the lesser stars . . . instantly resolved to enter the lists." These articles, while of uneven merit in respect to argument, served well the end for which they were written.[2] Another important function of Mr. Adams during these years was that of legal counsellor to the patriotic party. His advice was sought and followed in the graver controversies with Governor Hutchinson; and it was he who originated the brilliant and wholly successful project to impeach Chief-Justice Oliver.[3] His part throughout was that of a law-abiding citizen. He discountenanced the numerous acts of violence directed against the persons and property of the Loyalists; his approval of the destruction of the tea in Boston Harbor rested on political grounds; his defense of Captain Preston and his soldiers exhibited in the clearest light his respect for legal rights and his purpose to do his duty at whatever cost to popularity. Until 1774 he was a lawyer seeking professional success and at the same time serving his countrymen as their unsalaried teacher and adviser in matters pertaining to constitutional rights and the higher politics. In 1774 came a great change. He was chosen a delegate to the first Continental Congress. Henceforth for twenty-seven years, and without a break, he was to give his entire services to his country. Instantly the field widened; the continent took the place of the single colony; he journeyed to Philadelphia as a son of Massachusetts, an inquisitive and sometimes sharply critical observer of the strange peoples and manners that he met there and on the way thither; he returned from Philadelphia a continental American.

---

[1] III. 466.

[2] *Works*, IV. 5–177.

[3] *Works*, II. 328–332.

The second period extends from the assembling of the first Continental Congress to the treaty in which Great Britain acknowledged the independence of the United States, 1774 to 1783.

The work of John Adams at Philadelphia is too well known to call for rehearsal in this place.[1] He took part in the measures looking to reconciliation, but had little or no faith in their efficacy. He labored strenuously and with success for two ends: the union of the colonies and the separation from Great Britain. In so doing he brought himself into disfavor with Dickinson and other conservatives, but at the same time laid the foundations of that influence which later made him the strongest of the leaders of the Continental Congress. His motive in proposing the appointment of Washington to the command of the army was to promote the union of the colonies. He formed durable friendships with representative men from the different colonies. Through these friendships the way was opened for the propagation of his ideas on the proper structure of government. The Declaration of Independence was in one sense a personal vindication; but his letters, written at this period, speak only of the joy and exultation of the large-souled patriot who is also a seer and prophet:

> "When I look back to the year 1761, and recollect the argument concerning writs of assistance in the superior court, which I have hitherto considered as the commencement of this controversy between Great Britain and America, and run through the whole period from that time to this, and recollect the series of political events, the chain of causes and effects, I am surprised at the suddenness as well as greatness of this revolution. . . . It is the will of Heaven that the two countries should be sundered forever. It may be the will of Heaven that America shall suffer calamities still more wasting, and distresses yet more dreadful. If this is to be the case,

---

[1] In Judge Chamberlain's excellent essay entitled *John Adams, the Statesman of the American Revolution*, we have for the first time what seems to me an adequate estimate of the revolutionary service of John Adams.

it will have this good effect at least. It will inspire us with many virtues which we have not, and correct many errors, follies, and vices which threaten to disturb, dishonor, and destroy us. The furnace of affliction produces refinement in states as well as individuals. And the new Governments we are assuming in every part will require a purification from our vices, and an augmentation of our virtues, or they will be no blessings. The people will have unbounded power, and the people are extremely addicted to corruption and venality, as well as the great. But I must submit all my hopes and fears to an overruling Providence, in which, unfashionable as the faith may be, I firmly believe. . . The second day of July, 1776, will be the most memorable epocha in the history of America. I am apt to believe that it will be celebrated by succeeding generations as the great anniversary festival. It ought to be commemorated as the day of deliverance, by solemn acts of devotion to God Almighty. It ought to be solemnized with pomp and parade, with shows, games, sports, guns, bells, bonfires and illuminations, from one end of this continent to the other, from this time forward forevermore. You will think me transported with enthusiasm, but I am not. I am well aware of the toil and blood and treasure that it will cost us to maintain this Declaration and support and defend these States. Yet, through all the gloom, I can see the rays of ravishing light and glory."[1]

During the middle portion of this period Mr. Adams was chairman of the Board of War and a member of many other important congressional committees. Although possessing in but a moderate degree the talents for organization and administration which distinguished his later rival, Alexander Hamilton, he brought to these tasks certain qualities of mind and character which in a situation of appalling difficulty were of the highest value: he never doubted; he never quailed; he always had a plan; and his own faith and courage he communicated to others. In a very high degree he was the source of the moral energy without which the Revolution must have failed. These qualities he carried abroad and to them he owed his remarkable diplomatic success in Holland. At the Court of France it soon appeared that he could not work with Franklin:—so unlike and antipathetic were they by nature; nor could he reach an understanding with Vergennes, so that his record there was one of well-meant, unsparing but unsuccessful efforts. This failure, however, was nobly redeemed by the part he took in the negotiations for peace. To him in a special sense, his country owed her rights in the fisheries and a considerable portion of her territory. One graphic pen-picture of himself as a maker of this treaty is included in his diary. When discussing the American demands in regard to the fisheries an English negotiator proposed to substitute the word

---

[1] *Familiar Letters*, pp. 193, 194.

"liberty" for "right." "Upon this I rose up and said. 'Gentlemen, is there or can there be a clearer right? . . . . . When God Almighty made the banks of Newfoundland at three hundred leagues distance from the people of America, and at six hundred leagues distance from those of France and England, did he not give as good a right to the former as to the latter? If Heaven in the creation gave a right it is ours at least as much as yours. If occupation, use, and possession give a right, we have it as clearly as you. If war, and blood, and treasure give a right, ours is as good as yours.'"[1]

It is safe to say that the United States have never had a representative at a foreign court who better understood American rights or defended them more manfully. His country "was destined," so he believed, "to be the greatest power on earth;" and his claims for her were based on that belief. This was one of the reasons—perhaps the chief one—for his dislike of Vergennes: "I told him [Mr. Hartley, one of the British negotiators], the Comte de Vergennes and I were pursuing different objects; he was endeavoring to make my countrymen meek and humble, and I was laboring to make them proud; I avowed it was my object to make them hold up their heads and look down upon any nation that refused to do them justice."[2] In a letter to the President of Congress, dated Paris, September 5, 1783, he writes of national pride as follows:

> "We may call this national vanity or national pride, but it is the main principle of the national sense of its own dignity, and a passion in human nature, without which nations cannot preserve the character of man. Let the people lose this sentiment, as in Poland, and a partition of their country will soon take place. Our country has but lately been a dependent one, and our people, although enlightened and virtuous, have had their minds and hearts habitually filled with all the passions of a dependent and subordinate people; that is to say, with fear, with diffidence, and distrust of themselves, with admiration of foreigners, &c. Now, I say, that it is one of the most necessary and one of the most difficult branches of the policy of congress to eradicate from the American mind every remaining fibre of this fear and self-diffidence on one hand, and of this excessive admiration of foreigners on the other."[3]

Bitter indeed were his reflections upon that (fortunately disregarded) act of Congress which virtually transferred the negotiation from its own ministers to a foreign court. "Congress surrendered their own sovereignty into the hands of a French minister. Blush! Blush! ye guilty records! blush and perish! It is a glory to have broken such infamous orders."[4]

---

[1] *Works*, III. 333.

[2] *Works*, III. 365.

[3] *Works*, VIII. 144.

[4] *Works*, III. 359.

It fairly summarizes the foreign policy of John Adams to say that in the course of his diplomatic career we find him the earnest advocate of every principle of foreign policy recommended more than a decade afterwards in Washington's Farewell Address.

But even more important to the welfare of the United States than his services in Congress and abroad, great as they undoubtedly were, was the part he took in the reconstruction of government in the several colonies. The opportunity made a deep impression upon Adams. To Patrick Henry he wrote: "You and I, my dear friend, have been sent into life at a time when the greatest law-givers of antiquity would have wished to live. . . . When, before the present epocha, had three millions of people full power and a fair opportunity to form and establish the happiest and wisest government that human wisdom can contrive?"[1] This work began a few months before the Declaration of Independence, and in determining its character John Adams had far more influence than any other one man. Moreover, in directing the reorganization of government in the states, he was helping to lay the foundations of a national government for the United States.[2]

---

[1] *Works*, IV. 200.

[2] The materials for a study of the political system of John Adams are: 1. A letter to Richard Henry Lee, dated Philadelphia, November 15, 1775 (*Works*, IV. 185–187). 2. A letter to George Wythe, written in January, 1776, which was published under the title, *Thoughts on Government* (*ibid.*, 193–200). 3. A letter to John Penn in response to a request from the colonial legislature of North Carolina for the views of Mr. Adams on the "nature of the government it would be proper to form in case of the final dissolution of the authority of the Crown." This letter reproduces the substance of the *Thoughts on Government*, but in some places gives a fuller statement of the views of the writer (*ibid.*, 203–209). 4. *Report of the Constitution or Form of Government for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.* This was written in September 1779, and contains the ideas of Mr. Adams on the subject of government in their most complete and systematic form. Especially valuable is that portion of the report which contains the Declaration of Rights. Of the thirty articles, the third only, which provides for public worship, was not included in the original draft by Mr. Adams. Most of the changes made later by the Committee and the Convention affect the expression rather than the substance of the author's views. He had also the leading part in drafting the second part of the Constitution, or the *Frame of Government* (*ibid.*, 213–267). In order to appreciate the importance of Mr. Adams's *Model of Government* for Massachusetts and of the earlier sketches in the *Thoughts on Government*, it is necessary to remember that at the time they were prepared each of the American commonwealths was regarded as a sovereign state and that the constitution proposed was designed for such a state (*ibid.*, 217). 5. *A Defence of the Constitutions of Government of the United States of America*, in three volumes. The first volume was published in 1787, the second and third in the following year (*ibid.*, 269–588; V., VI. 1–220). 6. *Discourses on Davila*, published in 1790 (*ibid.*, 221–399). The *Defence* and the *Discourses* have the same object, namely, to establish by an appeal to history the soundness of the author's views on government as set forth in the *Thoughts* and *Model*.

Of great value too as expositions of the system are four letters of John Adams and Samuel Adams on government (*ibid.*, 405–426); three letters to Roger Sherman (*ibid.*, 427–442); a series of thirty-two letters to John Taylor (*ibid.*, 443–521), and a Review

John Adams held that in a properly constructed government there should be three branches, the legislative, executive and judicial. The legislative branch should consist, first, of an assembly to represent the people or the democratic element; second, of a senate to represent the aristocratic element; and lastly, of an executive to represent the state in its entirety; to act as umpire in cases of dispute between the aristocratic and democratic branches of the legislature; and to be the protector of each in case of an attempt at encroachment by the other. Each division of the legislature should possess an absolute veto. The judges should be appointed by the executive; should hold their offices during good behavior; and should not be subject to intimidation in the matter of salary. It is obvious that in its general framework this structure corresponds quite closely with that of England. Notable differences, however, are the more complete and uniform representation of the people, and the substitution of the elective for the hereditary principle in constituting the senate and executive. In respect to representation and the exclusion of the hereditary principle the system reproduces that of the colonies; in respect to the dependence of the senate and executive upon the people, the system conforms to that of Massachusetts (under her first charter), Connecticut and Rhode Island. The right of the executive to an absolute veto was copied from the theory of the English Constitution and from the actual practice in most of the colonies; in England it had not been exercised for nearly a century; but in all the colonies, except Rhode Island and Connecticut, both the royal and proprietary governors had used it so freely and in many cases so improperly, that it had become exceedingly obnoxious. It will be noted that the structural principle underneath this system is the independence of the several parts.

Turning to the views of Adams in regard to public policy we find that the end of government is the "happiness of the people." But the happiness of the people consists "in virtue," hence the effort of the statesman should be to secure the happiness of the people by the development of the "best character." The influence of a public man or measure upon the character of the people is to him a matter of prime importance. In furtherance of this end, namely, the development of the best character, public policy should foster religion, morality, and learning.[1]

---

of a Proposition for Amending the Constitution, submitted by Mr. Hillhouse to the Senate of the United States in 1808 (*ibid.*, 525–550).

[1] Article second of the Declaration of Rights which forms the first division of the Constitution of Massachusetts, affirms it to be "the duty of all men in society, publicly, and at stated seasons, to worship the SUPREME BEING" (*Works*, IV. 221). He

John Adams made religion the basis of his system of politics. He believed that the foundations of every political system are to be looked for in certain enduring convictions in respect to God, Nature and Man. Beneath systems of tyranny lie the conceptions of deity as cruel and despotic, of the natural world as ill regulated and unfriendly, of man as weak and unworthy; beneath systems of freedom lie the opposed convictions, that God is just and merciful, that the laws which govern the universe have their source in wisdom and goodness, and that in the nature of man there is a divine element which invests every human being with dignity, with rights and duties and with an infinite capacity for progress towards the ideally perfect.

There is no recorded word of John Adams which expresses a doubt of the existence of God, or of His justice, goodness, and active agency in the government of the world; on the contrary his diary, letters, and public utterances as well as his conduct prove that by nature and conviction he was deeply religious, and that he regarded true religion as the indispensable basis of human welfare private and public. He could not, however, accept the Calvinistic views which in his day still ruled New England theology. They contradicted too sharply his sense of the divine justice and goodness; it was for this reason that he decided soon after graduation from college to abandon the plan of entering the ministry and to prepare himself instead for the profession of the law. But in rejecting certain features of Calvinism he did not reject religion; on the contrary the rejection was for him a step towards a more natural and perfect development of the religious life. The best statesman in his view was he who most clearly discerned and most faithfully copied the divine plan of government.

"Statesmen . . . may plan and speculate for liberty," so he wrote at the age of eighty-five, "but it is religion and morality alone, which can establish the principles upon which freedom can securely stand." His view of the Christian religion as a factor in political education appears in one of the latest entries in his diary: "One great advantage of the Christian religion is, that it brings the great principle of the law of nature and nations—Love your neighbor as yourself,

---

wished to make the Christian religion a qualification for the office of governor, senator, and representative of Massachusetts. In his inaugural address as President he declares it his "fixed resolution to consider a decent respect for Christianity among the best recommendations for public service." (*Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, I. 232.) Although to the end of his days a "meeting-going animal," he was no bigot in matters of religion. He wished the Continental Congress to have nothing to do with religion except to "say their own prayers" and appoint each year a public Fast and Thanksgiving. In both of the constitutional conventions of which he was a member, he was ready to go further than his associates in establishing religious freedom.

and do to others as you would that others should do to you—to the knowledge, belief, and veneration of the whole people. . . No other institution for education, no kind of political discipline, could diffuse this kind of necessary information, so universally. . . . The duties and rights of the man and the citizen are thus taught from early infancy to every creature."[1]

In a letter to his wife dated November 5, 1775, he discourses on the relations of religion to patriotism as follows : "A true patriot must be a religious man. I have been led to think . . . that he who neglects his duty to his Maker may well be expected to be deficient and insincere in his duties towards the public. Even suppose him to possess a large share of what is called honor and public spirit, yet do not these men, by their bad example, by a loose immoral conduct, corrupt the minds of youth and vitiate the morals of the age and thus injure the public more than they can compensate by intrepidity, generosity and honor?"[2] And yet no religious man of his day was more tolerant than he.

Other essential features of a sound public policy are a generous provision for the education of the people, liberality towards institutions of higher learning and fair compensation for public service. Adams held that the people could not afford to accept uncompensated service ; to do so was inconsistent with their self-respect, and in the end would prove costly and demoralizing.

The third period extends from the treaty of peace to the election of Mr. Adams as President, 1783 to 1796. He remained abroad five years after signing the treaty. One was spent in diplomatic service in Holland, the others as minister plenipotentiary at the court of St. James. In the drama of history, it was a great moment when John Adams the former arch-rebel first stood in the presence of George III., as the representative of a free people, once the loyal subjects of His Britannic Majesty ; and who could know and feel its significance so well as he to whom this august scene was the consummation of all that he had hoped and toiled for ? His own account shows how profoundly his whole nature was stirred ; and nobly did he bear himself ; when he declared "I have no attachment save to my own country," even the King was moved, and uttered the true-hearted words : "No honest man will have any other." But this proved to be only a transient gleam of good sense and magnanimity on the part of the monarch ; the perverseness through which he had alienated and lost the colonies, led him and his ministers to refuse the rational and mutually beneficial propositions of Mr. Adams in regard to commerce. The minister and his family were made to feel both at court and in society, and in a very personal way, the dislike and disesteem in which their country was held. Even Burke and Camden, whom Americans justly revered, seemed to the sufferer participants in the ignoble persecution. But what had these unhappy experiences to do with the politics of John Adams? It is probable that they account in some measure for that feeling of settled distrust towards English policy, that pessimism in respect to the future of England, and that prompt rejection of every measure of foreign policy which would in any degree make the United States dependent upon England that marked his course henceforth,—for, in short, that policy towards England which was a chief cause of difference between himself and the Federalist party.

---

[1] *Works*, III. 423.

[2] *Familiar Letters*, 122.

Baffled in his efforts at the English court and moved by ill news from America where the democracy was seeking, especially in Massachusetts, to overthrow the balanced system of government in the establishment of which he had taken so distinguished a part, John Adams seized the occasion offered by the belated publication of M. Turgot's criticisms of the American governments, to write a defence of the principles on which they were founded. He began this work in October of 1786, and finished it in late December of 1787. The first volume, entitled *A Defence of the Constitutions of the Governments of the United States of America*, reached Philadelphia in time to influence the deliberations of the framers of the Constitution of 1787. The work is a defence on philosophical and historical grounds of the balanced system of government already described. In a special sense it is a defence of the aristocratic and executive elements of government; for these were then under attack. The general result of an extended survey of the history of governments, ancient, medieval and modern, and of theories of government set forth by writers on politics, may be stated as follows: Every simple government, whether democratic, aristocratic or monarchical, is of necessity despotic: among such, as reason would teach us to expect, history clearly proves that the democratic is the worst. What actually came to pass a few years later in that phase of the French Revolution named the Reign of Terror, the writer foretold as the natural result of the attempt to establish a purely democratic government. Moreover, although the plan of a simple democracy has been tried in a number of instances, it has never yet succeeded; nor in the nature of the case, can it ever do so. Despotism is equally inevitable under a simple aristocracy or monarchy. Nor can we find a single instance of good and stable government under systems which unite any two of the three principles while excluding the third; for in such equilibrium is impossible;

a struggle for ascendency is sure to follow; and this must issue after the overthrow of the weaker principle in the despotism of the stronger. A feature of the *Defence* which aroused the distrust of radical democrats at home was the emphasis laid upon the value of the aristocratic element in the state. To seek to do away with aristocracy is idle; for it is a creation of nature. Whatever a man possesses that gives him an advantage over others makes of him an aristocrat. There is nowhere a society without its aristocratic section. To this belong those who have beauty, the well-born, the rich, the talented, the virtuous. Boston has her nobles—so he wrote Samuel Adams—as well as Madrid. "Hereditary powers and peculiar privileges enter in no degree necessarily into the definition of Aristocracy;" and the Americans have wisely discarded them. The views of John Adams upon aristocracy have been so widely misapprehended that they should be stated in his own words. In 1814, in a series of letters to John Taylor, he gave what is perhaps the most comprehensive of the many definitions that may be traced to his pen:

"By natural aristocracy, in general, may be understood those superiorities of influence in society which grow out of the constitution of human nature. By artificial aristocracy, those inequalities of weight and superiorities of influence which are created and established by civil laws. Terms must be defined before we can reason. By aristocracy, I understand all those men who can command, influence, or procure more than an average of votes; by an aristocrat, every man who can and will influence one man to vote besides himself. Few men will deny that there is a natural aristocracy of virtues and talents in every nation and in every party, in every city and village. Inequalities are a part of the natural history of man."[1]

"This natural aristocracy among mankind, has been dilated on, because it is a fact essential to be considered in the institution of a government. It forms a body of men which contains the greatest collection of virtues and abilities in a free government, is the brightest ornament and glory of the nation, and may always be made the greatest blessing of society, if it be judiciously managed in the constitution. But if this be not done, it is always the most dangerous, nay, it may be added, it never fails to be the destruction of the commonwealth . . . There is but one expedient yet discovered, to avail society of all the benefits from this body of men, which they are capable of affording, and at the same time, to prevent them from undermining or invading the public liberty; and that is, to throw them all, or at least the most remarkable of them, into one assembly together, in the legislature; to keep all the executive power entirely out of their hands as a body; to erect a first magistrate over them, invested with the whole executive authority; to make them dependent on that same executive magistrate for all public executive employments; to give that first magistrate a negative on the legislature."[1]

---

[1] *Works*, VI. 451.

Strongly too did he emphasize the necessity for an executive deriving his authority directly from the people, completely independent of the legislature, capable of representing "the majesty, persons, wills and power of the people in the administration of government and dispensing of laws," and powerful enough to maintain "the balance between the Senate and House, or in other words between the aristocratical and democratical interests."

As happened when the state governments were formed, so now at the framing of the national Constitution the views of John Adams were accepted only in part. To the Senate was given a participation in executive functions which Mr. Adams predicted would transform the President of the United States into a slave of party, and at the same time would corrupt the Senate. Legislative participation in the appointing power he thought as baneful to government as rust to iron, as arsenic to the human body. He also thought it a great defect of the Constitution that it did not give to the President the absolute veto.

The election of John Adams to the vice-presidency in 1788, and re-election four years later, prove that despite the unpopular doctrines of the *Defence*, he was still, in the esteem of the people, second only to Washington. During these comparatively tranquil years he gave cordial support to Washington and the Federalist party. In 1790 while the French Revolution was still under the control of the moderates, he took his pen in hand and in a series of *Discourses on Davila* pointed out the grave not to say ruinous errors committed by the leaders of that fateful movement. He did more: in order to make the reasonableness of his condemnation evident, he formulated more fully than in his earlier writings the theory of social man on which his system of politics rested:

"Men, in their primitive conditions, however savage, were undoubtedly gregarious; and they continue to be social, not only in every stage of civilization, but in every possible situation in which they can be placed. As nature intended them for society, she has furnished them with passions, appetites, and propensities, as well as a variety of faculties, calculated both for their individual enjoyment, and to render them useful to each other in their social connections. There is none among them more essential or remarkable, than the passion for distinction. A desire to be observed, considered, esteemed, praised, beloved, and admired by his fellows, is one of the earliest, as well as keenest dispositions discovered in the heart of man . . . The desire of the esteem of others is as real a want of nature as hunger; and the neglect and contempt of the world as severe a pain as the gout or stone."

---

[1] *Works*, IV. 397, 398.

"The poor man's conscience is clear; yet he is ashamed. His character is irreproachable; yet he is neglected and despised. He feels himself out of the sight of others, groping in the dark. Mankind take no notice of him. He rambles and wanders unheeded. In the midst of a crowd, at church, in the market, at a play, at an execution, or coronation, he is in as much obscurity as he would be in a garret or a cellar. He is not disapproved, censured or reproached; he is only not seen. . . . If you follow these persons, however, into their scenes of life, you will find that there is a kind of figure which the meanest of them all endeavors to make; a kind of little grandeur and respect, which the most insignificant study and labor to procure in the small circle of their acquaintances. Not only the poorest mechanic, but the man who lives upon common charity, nay, the common beggars in the streets; and not only those who may be all innocent, but even those who have abandoned themselves to common infamy, as pirates, highwaymen and common thieves, court a set of admirers, and plume themselves upon that superiority which they have, or fancy they have, over some others. There must be one, indeed, who is the last and lowest of the human species. But there is no risk in asserting, that there is no one who believes and will acknowledge himself to be the man. To be wholly overlooked, and to know it, are intolerable. When a wretch could no longer attract the notice of a man, woman or child, he must be respectable in the eyes of his dog. 'Who will love me then?' was the pathetic reply of one, who starved himself to feed his mastiff, to a charitable passenger, who advised him to kill or sell the animal. In this 'who will love me then?' there is a key to the human heart; to the history of human life and manners, and to the rise and fall of empires.

"This passion, while it is simply a desire to excel another, by fair industry in the search of truth and the practice of virtue, is properly called Emulation. When it aims at power, as a means of distinction, it is Ambition. When it is in a situation to suggest the sentiments of fear and apprehension, that another, who is now inferior, will become superior, it is denominated Jealousy. When it is in a state of mortification, at the superiority of another, and desires to bring him down to our level, or to depress him below us, it is properly called Envy. When it deceives a man into a belief of false professions of esteem or admiration, or into a false opinion of his importance in the judgment of the world, it is Vanity. These observations alone would be sufficient to show, that this propensity, in all its branches, is a principal source of the virtues and vices, the happiness and misery of human life; and that the history of mankind is little more than a simple narration of its operation and effects."[1]

---

[1] *Works*, VI. 232–239.

From such principles it followed that those Frenchmen who were striving to suppress the inequalities which arise from this universal "thirst for distinction" were at war with nature. Indeed, Adams held that the only equality practicable and desirable is equality before the laws. "Too many Frenchmen," so he wrote Dr. Price, "after the example of too many Americans, pant after equality of persons and property. The impracticability of this God Almighty has decreed."[1] Such views and sentiments however wise ran counter to the strong tides of American political passion. The result to himself of giving them utterance he afterwards described in a letter to Jefferson: "In truth my *Defence of the Constitutions* and *Discourses on Davila* were the causes of that immense unpopularity which fell like the tower of Siloam upon me. Your steady defence of democratic principles, and your invariable favorable opinion of the French Revolution, laid the foundation of your unbounded popularity."[2] And yet despite this immense unpopularity with the democratic masses, despite the well-grounded fear of many Federalist leaders that this man of strong will and independent views might prove unmanageable, and despite the treacherous plan to give to Pinckney the place which the voters allotted to him, John Adams was chosen as the successor of Washington.

With this event opened the last chapter of his public career. Throughout the previous period, fidelity to his country and to his political system had made him the advocate of a policy that coincided with that of the Federalists; but now the tie between him and the leaders of the Federalist party, particularly those whose homes were in the North, was about to be broken. The forces that did this were two: first a difference of view in respect to foreign policy; and second, a disagreement as to the proper functions and rights of the executive. We need not rehearse here the story of the struggle between the President and his cabinet, the latter acting under the direction of Hamilton and in collusion with leading Federalist senators: it will suffice to point out that when the secretaries undertook to thwart the President in his purpose to renew negotiations with France, and also when they sought by a clandestine appeal to Washington to secure the appointment of Hamilton to the virtual command of the army, they arrogated to themselves rights which the Constitution had conferred upon their official chief. Pickering, Wolcott, and McHenry were not prompted by motives of personal ambition. They were doing the will of a division of the Federal party whose leader was Hamiliton; their plan was to transfer to him the high functions which belong to the President. No one questions now that John Adams was in the right in renewing the negotiations with France; in the long series of services that he rendered his country, this was certainly one of the most heoric and beneficent. Nor does any one question now his view of the functions of President and cabinet. But in bestowing peace on his country and in maintaining the rights of her chief magistrate he alienated an important section of the Federal party.

---

[1] *Works*, IX. 564.

[2] *Works*, X. 54.

The party revolution of 1800 brought the public career of John Adams to a close, but not, however, until he had named John Marshall as chief justice, a nomination second in importance in its bearing on the welfare of the Union only to that which was made by him a quarter of a century earlier, when he proposed the name of George Washington as commander-in-chief of the Continental Army.

With the possible exception of Daniel Webster no other American statesman of the highest rank has retired so hated and unfriended as did John Adams. The followers of Jefferson regarded him as a monarchist and a persecutor of democrats; the followers of Hamilton as a traitor to the cause of Federalism. But the truth is that his course from the beginning was singularly consistent. His simple creed was this: in order that a state may prosper it must have in its government a democratic element, an aristocratic element and an executive; each of these must be strong enough to maintain its rights; but each must be checked in its attempts to encroach upon the others. In the first and second periods he devoted himself to the championship of the endangered American democracy and to the reconstruction of the colonial governments on the lines given above; in the third period he devoted himself to the championship of the aristocratic interest against the encroaching disposition of the democracy, and to the further exposition and defence of his system; in the fourth period he devoted himself to the championship of the executive against the encroachments of the aristocratic party; and he was surely in the right. We name only half the truth in claiming for America the mission to produce a finer type of democracy; a strong and healthful democracy without a strong and healthful aristocracy is impossible; the two are essential parts of one organic whole. A higher type of aristocracy,—an aristocracy open to every aspiring soul, without legal privilege, based on merit, assigning its highest honor to highest service, welcoming the lowly-born Abraham Lincoln as heartily as the patrician-born George Washington,—to produce such an aristocracy is the only way to produce a healthful, happy, useful democracy; and to help to establish this type of aristocracy throughout the world is the highest service which America can render to mankind, but this—just this, was what John Adams wished and worked for.

It is narrated that five days before that memorable fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence on which both he and Jefferson were to die, John Adams gave as a toast to be presented at the celebration to be held by his fellow-townsmen, the words INDEPENDENCE FOREVER. "In this brief sentiment," says his biographer, "Mr. Adams infused the essence of his whole character, and of his life-long labors for his country." But independence, however characteristic of the spirit and method, does not seem to me an adequate description of the "essence" of his labors. It is true that he maintained always an unusual degree of personal independence, and that he strove with all his might for "independent independence" in his country's behalf—but only as the necessary means to a certain end; and this end was the attainment of the "best character." The key to the politics of John Adams is the right and duty incumbent upon each citizen, each class, the people as a whole and mankind, of complete self-realization. To protcet and assist the process by which this is accomplished, determines for him the form and functions of government and the aim of public policy. For the divine right to rule, whether claimed by king, parliament or party, he substituted the divine indefeasible right of the people to grow.

ANSON D. MORSE.

THE FIRST REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

THE convention which met in Pittsburg on the 22d of February, 1856, for the purpose of organizing a national Republican party, was called together by the chairmen of the Republican state committees of Ohio, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Vermont and Wisconsin. It was not a convention of delegates selected by constituent assemblies of the people, but a mass convention of men who favored the formation of a great national anti-slavery party and who volunteered their services in the undertaking. It was in session two days, and its purpose was fully accomplished, but the report of its proceedings in the newspapers of the time was meagre and inadequate. They were published in pamphlet soon after the convention, but they covered only a few pages, being a mere skeleton of what happened and even less satisfactory than the newspaper reports, while they gave the reader no conception of the spirit and character of the gathering. No roll of the members was preserved, while the several histories of political parties and conventions which have since appeared contain little more than a mere reference to the subject. Since the writer is one of the very few survivors of the convention, and was officially and somewhat actively connected with its proceedings, and since there is always a natural curiosity to know something of the beginnings of a great historic movement, perhaps a brief paper on the subject may prove timely and not entirely without value as a contribution to the literature of politics.

The creation of the proposed new party was a vexed problem. The Whig party had received its death-blow in the presidential campaign of 1852, but it still had a lingering and fragmentary existence. In Michigan its members had united with the Free Soilers and bolting Democrats in state convention as early as July 6, 1854, in forming a Republican party and giving it that name, and this action was followed soon after by like movements in Wisconsin and Vermont. In New York and Massachusetts the Whigs refused to disband, and thus prevented the desired action in these states during the years 1854 and 1855. In Indiana a combination was formed consisting of conservative Whigs, anti-Nebraska Democrats, Know-nothings and Free Soilers. It called itself "the People's Party," and for three years in succession, beginning in 1854, it disowned the name

Republican and subordinated every question of principle to its desire for political success. The situation was most humiliating, but with the nomination of Frémont, Indiana finally started upon its journey out of the wilderness. The formation of a new party in Illinois in 1854 was attempted, but was defeated by the Whigs, who persuaded Abraham Lincoln to avoid any connection with such a movement. The political elements in that state were similar to those in Indiana. In Ohio the new party was launched in 1854 on the basis of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and opposition to the extension of slavery, and Mr. Chase was chosen senator in 1855. Like action was taken in Iowa. In Maine, as in Pennsylvania, a Republican party was not formed till 1856. The Whigs of the northern states generally, and a large proportion of the anti-Nebraska Democrats, finally found their way into the Republican camp through the lodges of Know-nothingism, which served as a convenient escape from their old political bosses. This secret political movement still further complicated the situation. Its action had a two-fold effect. On the one hand, it did good service in the breaking up of the old parties which had so long stood as the bulwarks of slavery; but on the other, its crusade against the Pope and the foreigner tended to balk the rising popular indignation caused by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, and thus to divide the people upon side issues instead of uniting them as one man on the single question of slavery. In 1855, Know-nothingism elected the governors of nine northern states and forty-three members of the national House of Representatives. It acted in the dark, and thus fearfully aggravated the political confusion and bewilderment of the times.

A very formidable element had to be reckoned with in the old Free Soil party, which rejoiced in the omens of an anti-slavery revival, but demanded the recognition of its principles in the new organization. This party had given over 291,000 votes in 1848, but four years later it gave only a little over 156,000. This falling off was chiefly caused by the Barnburners of New York and their sympathizers, who had rallied under the Free Soil banner in 1848 for the purpose of punishing their party for throwing Van Buren overboard in 1844, and who now returned to the party fold. The Free Soilers of 1852 however were stronger without this trading element than with it. They stood upon a magnificent platform, and they had the courage of their convictions; and they so commanded the respect of all parties that in 1853, before the repeal of the Missouri Compromise had been attempted, concerted measures had been extensively set on foot for the formation of a national anti-slavery party consisting of Free Soilers, disbanded Whigs and dissatisfied Democrats. It is morally if not logically certain that such a party would have been organized, and would finally have triumphed if the repeal of the Missouri Compromise had never been proposed. The Free Soilers, however, were not partisans, and they were perfectly willing to disband their organization and lose themselves in a larger movement committed to the essential articles of their political faith. We ought to add, perhaps, that there was still another element which demanded attention in all the states. This was the temperance reform as expounded and enforced in Maine. This movement was then in its first stages, and its progress was amazing. Its champions were on fire with zeal, and their devotion to their cause was a passion. They disputed the proposition that slavery was the paramount question in our politics. Their demand was for the search, seizure, confiscation and destruction of liquors kept for illegal sale. The rum-seller was to be dealt with as a criminal, and the whole fabric of intemperance overthrown by the fiat of legislative prohibition. Such was the political situation in 1856. While the disruption of the old parties seemed easy and imminent, it was equally clear that the organization of their fragments into a new party on a true basis was a totally different problem.

The convention assembled at eleven o'clock in La Fayette Hall, a building which disappeared years ago to make room for a larger structure. It was called to order by Hon. Lawrence Brainerd, of Vermont, who read the call upon which it had convened and asked John A. King, of New York, a son of Rufus King, to act as temporary chairman. After brief and appropriate remarks, Mr. King called on the Rev. Owen Lovejoy, who was present as a representative from Illinois, to open the proceedings with prayer. The name of Lovejoy was an inspiration, for it recalled the murder of his brother by a mob at Alton in 1837, for merely exercising his constitutional right of free speech in a free state in talking about slavery. The heart of the people was manifestly and fervently with him, and there was a suppressed murmur of applause when he asked God to enlighten the mind of the President of the United States, and turn him from his evil ways, and if this was not possible, to take him away, so that an honest and God-fearing man might fill his place. A committee on permanent organization was then appointed, and while it was engaged in its work in an adjoining room the people seemed to be hungry for speeches. When Horace Greeley, with his earnest, kindly face and long white coat, was seen in the audience, he was enthusiastically called for. On taking the platform, he was received with prolonged cheers. He did not speak at length, but said he had been in Washington several weeks, and that our friends there counselled extreme caution in our movements. He referred to the fact that the powers of the Federal government were in the hands of our enemies, mentioning particularly Jefferson Davis, the Secretary of War, from whom we could count upon no favors. The burden of his speech was the necessity for great caution and moderation on our part. This caused some surprise in the audience, as Mr. Greeley had not been generally regarded as a special examplar of the virtues he commended; and he afterwards explained himself in the *Tribune* by saying that he had reference to large numbers of good men who had joined the Know-nothing or American party who were at heart entirely with us, and he did not wish to antagonize them in any way in the proceedings of the convention. At the close of Mr. Greeley's remarks, Mr. Giddings was tumultuously called for, and responded by saying that Washington was the last place in the word to look for council or redress, and illustrated his meaning by relating an anecdote of two pious brothers named Joseph and John who in early times had begun a settlement in the West. Joseph prayed, "O Lord! we have begun a good work; we pray Thee to carry it on thus," giving specific directions. But John prayed, "O Lord! we have begun a good work; carry it on as You think best, and don't mind what Joe says." Mr. Giddings then introduced the Rev. Owen Lovejoy, of Illinois, "Not Joe, but John." Mr. Lovejoy's speech was characteristic. It was full of fire, denouncing the administration of Franklin Pierce and the interference of border-ruffians from Missouri with the affairs of Kansas. He hoped that the proceedings in that state would arouse such a storm of indignation as would show itself in Kansas and make every man a martyr rather than submit to the infamous laws of the Lecompton legislature. "Who would not lose his life in such a cause? In defense of Kansas I will offer myself as a captain, and if not wanted in that capacity, I will shoulder a gun and go as a private. If I use my Sharp's rifle, I will shoot in God's name. I am for war to the knife, and the knife to the hilt, if it must be so." Preston King, of New York, was called on for a speech, but excused himself, when Col. Gibson, of Ohio, being loudly called for, addressed the convention on the Know-nothing movement. I think he was then without a rival in the West as a stump speaker. There was an irresistible fascination in his oratory which recalled that of Prentiss of Mississippi in his palmiest days. No audience could ever grow tired of listening to him.

Simeon Draper of New York, from the committee on organization, now reported the following permanent officers:

President Francis P. Blair, of Maryland; vice-presidents, Horatio G. Russ, New Hampshire; Lawrence Brainerd, Vermont; George Bliss, Massachusetts; James M. Bunce, Connecticut; R. G. Hazard, Rhode Island; E. D. Morgan, New York; W. P. Sherman, New Jersey; Joseph Farley, Virginia; Gen. Joseph Markle, Pennsylvania; W. S. Bailey, Kentucky; W. Penn Clarke, Iowa; R. P. Spalding, Ohio; George W. Julian, Indiana; John H. McMillan, Illinois; Gov. Kinsley S. Bingham, Michigan; David Jones, Wisconsin; T. P. Newton, Minnesota; Lewis Clephane, District of Columbia; secretaries, Russell Errett, Pennsylvania; D. R. Tilden, Ohio; Isaac Dayton, New York; John C. Vaughn, Illinois; J. W. Stone, Massachusetts.

Mr. Blair was escorted to the chair by Preston King of New York and Jacob Brinkerhoff of Ohio, and was greeted with unbounded enthusiasm. He was in feeble health, and probably the oldest man in the convention. He was a journalist of distinction and a politician of national reputation. He was a soldier in our last war with England and was everywhere known as the trusted friend of Gen. Jackson. He had separated from his party in 1848, and given his vote for Van Buren and Adams, and he appeared in this convention as one of the representatives of the South, which had delegates from Texas, Kentucky, Missouri, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, South Carolina and Tennessee. Upon taking the chair, Mr. Blair remarked that this was the first speech he had ever been called on to make, and that he could not refrain from expressing how much he felt honored by the action of the convention in making him its president. He considered it, however, more as a compliment to the men with whom he had been associated and whom he represented than to any personal merit. He submitted a paper which he commended to the consideration of the convention as the platform of his Southern friends. It was not acted on. It was remarkably well written and evidently prepared with great care; but he strangely misconceived the spirit and purpose of the convention. His anti-slavery ideal was the Compromise of 1850, which had abandoned the Wilmot Proviso and paved the way for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise; and he now demanded the restoration of that Compromise as the sole panacea for our troubles. The convention was not beating a retreat to the finality platforms of 1852, but marching in the opposite direction. At the conclusion of Mr. Blair's remarks a recess was taken.

At the afternoon session Abijah Mann, of New York, offered a resolution which was adopted, that a committee of one from each state be appointed to draw up an address and resolutions for the consideration of the convention. The following committee was selected: Abijah Mann, of New York; George M. Weston, Maine; F. C. Johnson, New Hampshire; Lawrence Brainerd, Vermont; E. R. Hoar, Massachusetts; ex-Gov. Chauncey F. Cleveland, Connecticut; R. G. Hazard, Rhode Island; F. Devereaux, New Jersey; John Allison, Pennsylvania; W. H. Dennison, Delaware; Francis P. Blair, Maryland; James S. Farley, Virginia; James Redpath, Missouri; W. S. Bailey, Kentucky; D. H. Spratt, California; C. G. Hawthorne, Iowa; James Dennison, Ohio; Oliver P. Morton, Indiana; John C. Vaughn, Illinois; Jacob M. Howard, Michigan; Israel Love, Wisconsin; S. N. Wood, Kansas; T. M. Houston, Minnesota; Lewis Clephane, District of Columbia.

The appointment of a committee on national organization was the next business in order, and was discussed at some length. It was finally decided that this committee should consist of one member from each state, and it was constituted as follows: Abner Hallowell, Maine; J. C. Beman, New Hampshire; Charles G. Davis, Massachusetts; Mark Howell, Connecticut; R. G. Hazard, Rhode Island; William A. Sackett, New York; C. M. K. Pollison, New Jersey; William H. Dennison, Delaware; William B. Thomas, Pennsylvania; F. Kemper, Missouri; W. S. Bailey, Kentucky; A. J. Stevens, Iowa; Charles Reemelin, Ohio; George W. Julian, Indiana; Owen Lovejoy, Illinois; Zachariah Chandler, Michigan; Charles Durkee, Wisconsin.

At this point, the presiding officer read a despatch from Philadelphia which he had just received, relative to the proceedings of the National Council of the American, or Know-nothing, party, which was then in session. It was as follows:

"PHILADELPHIA, PA., Feb. 22, 1856.

"The American party is no longer a unit. The national council has gone to pieces. Raise the Republican banner. The North Americans are with you.

THOMAS SPOONER."

The dispatch was loudly cheered by the convention. Speech-making now became the order of the day, and Preston King, Charles Reemelin, George W. Julian, Joshua R. Giddings and D. Ripley, of New Jersey, all addressed the convention at some length. Mr. King spoke in his customary tone of kindliness and conciliation, and his hopeful view of the progress of freedom and the outcome of the new movement was heartily responded to by the audience. By far the strongest speech of the convention was that of Charles Reemelin, then a prominent and influential German politician of

Cincinnati, who died a few years ago. His arraignment of Know-nothingism as a scheme of bigotry and intolerance, and a mischievous side-issue, was vigorous and unsparing. He was a Democrat, but the course of his party had made him an independent. He was a man of recognized ability and integrity, and his utterances were enthusiastically applauded. Mr. Julian spoke on the same subject and expressed kindred views. Mr. Giddings made one of his happiest efforts. He gave an amusing account of the recent struggle for the speakership which resulted in the election of Banks, interspersed with anecdotes which provoked roars of laughter and cheers. He was constitutionally hopeful, touching the progress of the anti-slavery cause, but recent events had given him new accessions of faith, and he poured himself forth in jubilant anticipations which seemed to be as delightful to his hearers as to himself. But the last speaker, Mr. Ripley, created the sensation of the day. He began by giving an account of his experience in the lumber business, and called himself "the saw-log man." The relevancy of his remarks to the business of the convention was exceedingly remote, and he was several times called to order; but the drollery of his effort and the flashes of humor which lighted up his backwoods style of oratory disarmed opposition, and he was allowed to proceed. It was said at the time that his speech rivalled the finest specimens of Yankee comedy. This closed the first day of the convention, and left its members in an enviable state of good humor. But it was not an accident. The Know-nothings had been subjected to pretty rough handling, and many believed that Mr. Greeley's counsel of "caution" and "moderation" had not been duly heeded. It was arranged, accordingly, that "the saw-log man" should be heard, as a diversion from the more serious work of the convention and a means of restoring general harmony and good-will.

When the convention assembled on the second day of its labors considerable time was occupied in listening to ten-minute speeches by representatives of the different states, giving an account of the progress of free principles in the various sections of the Union. A letter was then read from Cassius M. Clay, which was ordered to be printed. He was then in his prime, and it was one of the happiest of his notable public utterances. Its tone was in striking contrast with that of the paper submitted by Mr. Blair. The latter pleaded for moderation, and appealed to the spirit of compromise; but Clay pleaded for political courage and appealed to American manhood, while he invoked the spirit of our republican fathers in facing the despotism of the slave oligarchy. His words were shot and shell. As an impassioned and powerful arraignment of slavery by a Southern man his letter reminded one of Jefferson's arraignment of George the Third, and through its extensive publication in the newspapers it must have done excellent service in guiding and inspiring the great party then about to be created.

As chairman of the committee on national organization, George W. Julian then submitted the report of that committee, which embodied the following recommendations:

1. The appointment of a national executive committee consisting of one from each state and constituted as follows: E. D. Morgan, New York, chairman; George G. Fogg, New Hampshire; N. P. Banks, Massachusetts; Lawrence Brainerd, Vermont; John M. Niles, Connecticut; William Chase, Jr., Rhode Island; C. M. K. Pollison, New Jersey; David Wilmot, Pennsylvania; F. P. Blair, Jr., Missouri; Rev. J. G. Fee, Kentucky; A. J. Stevens, Iowa; A. P. Stone, Ohio; William Grose, Indiana; E. D. Leland, Illinois; Charles Dickey, Michigan; Wyman Spooner, Wisconsin; Lewis Clephane, District of Columbia; ex-Governor Alexander Ramsey, Minnesota.

2. That the National Executive Committee be authorized to add to their number from each state not now represented in said committee, and to fill vacancies.

3. The committee further recommend the holding of a Republican National Convention for the nomination of candidates for President and Vice-President at Philadelphia, on Tuesday, the 17th day of June next, to be composed of delegates from the several states equal in number to twice the representation in Congress to which each state is entitled.

4. That the Republicans of the different states be recommended to complete their organization at the earliest practicable moment by the appointment of state, county and district committees; and the state and county committees are requested to organize the respective counties by Republican clubs in every town or township throughout the land.

On motion of S. N. Wood, of Kansas, Gen. Charles Robinson of that territory was made an additional member of the National Executive Committee; and the third recommendation, on the motion of Mr. Lovejoy, was amended so as to make the delegates to the national convention consist of three from each congressional district. The report of the committee on organization as thus amended was adopted, and the national Republican Party became a fact.

Mr. Mann, of New York, from the Committee on Address and Resolutions, now made his report. His address was very lengthy, occupying two hours in the reading, and was a pretty thorough over-hauling of the slavery question in general, and particularly of the overthrow of the Missouri Compromise and the outrages in Kansas which followed. Its authorship was credited to Henry J. Raymond, of the *New York Times*, and it concluded as follows:

"We therefore declare to the people of the United States as the objects for which we unite in political action:

"1. That we demand and shall attempt to secure the repeal of all laws which allow the introduction of slavery into territory now consecrated to freedom, and will resist by every constitutional means the existence of slavery in any of the territories of the United States;

"2. We will support by every lawful means our brethren in Kansas in their constitutional and manly resistance to the usurped authority of their lawless invaders; and we will give the full weight of our political power in favor of the immediate admission of Kansas to the Union as a free, sovereign and independent state;

"3. Believing the present national administration has shown itself to be weak and faithless, and as its continuance in power is identified with the progress of the slave power to national supremacy, with the exclusion of freedom from the territories, and with unceasing civil discord, it is a leading purpose of our organization to oppose and overthrow it."

These declarations might have gone farther, but they were substantially sufficient. They demanded the freedom of Kansas and all our national territories, which meant, of course, the restriction of slavery to the states in which it existed. Such restriction, the slaveholders believed, would pave the way for its destruction. It was because they believed that the Wilmot Proviso threatened slavery with gradual suffocation and ultimate death that they demanded the abrogation of the Missouri Compromise and organized their bloody raid into Kansas. Their policy was the expansion of slavery as the chosen means of saving its life and perpetuating its rule, while the Republican policy was the restriction of slavery as the chosen means of saving the life of the nation and preserving the principles of democracy. No issue could have been more vital, and on this issue a great national party now planted itself and entered upon its stormy career.

This convention represented all of the sixteen northern and eight of the southern states. Its members came together in the dead of winter, when no candidates were to be nominated and no offices were to be divided. Probably a majority of them had passed the meridian of life, but all seemed equally in earnest and absorbed in their work. A few of them were already known to political fame, such as Joshua R. Giddings, Preston King and David Wilmot, while others, like Zachariah Chandler, Edwin D. Morgan, and Oliver P. Morton, were afterwards to become honorably conspicuous. The great body of the members had never devoted themselves to the business of politics, and this was indicated by the composition of the several committees selected by the convention for the execution of its work. It was a season of unparallelled political chaos, in which doubt and apprehension largely ruled the hour. Good men sometimes lost their way, or saw but dimly the path of safety. Politic statesmen took counsel of their fears. A number of notable men in the convention took little or no part in its proceedings. Many undoubtedly failed to attend because they thought it wiser to wait upon the teaching of events. It was the element of uncalculating radicalism which baffled the policy of timidity and hesitation and saved the cause. Of the nine Free Soilers who held the balance of power in the lower branch of the Congress of 1849, five were in this convention and among its active workers. The convention stood by them. Only five of the northern states had taken the initiative in calling it; but its members, most fortunately, had the courage of their convictions. Their devotion to the cause and singleness of purpose kept them steadfast. They could have had no conception of the magnitude of the work which they were beginning. They did not dream of the civil war which was to result from the splendid courage of the new party in standing by its principles, nor of the magnificent part it was to play in crushing a great slave-holders' rebellion. As little did they dream of the total extirpation of slavery in the United States in less than nine years, and its abolition throughout the civilized world which was to follow. They were building better than they knew. This was strikingly illustrated by Mr. Greeley's account of the convention in the *Tribune*, in which he said, "its moral and political effect will be felt for a quarter of a century." He did not see the greatness of the work which had been inaugurated, because the angle of his vision left it outside of his horizon; but he lived to see the curtain lifted, and to realize that the movement in which he had shared involved the life of the Republic, the emancipation of a race, and the grand march of democratic government towards its world-wide triumph.

GEORGE W. JULIAN.

DOCUMENTS

1. Santiago, and the Freeing of Spanish America, 1741.

After Admiral Vernon and General Wentworth had failed in their attack on Carthagena, they left that place, at the end of April and the beginning of May, 1741, and sailed to Jamaica. There on May 26 a council of war was held, consisting of Admiral Vernon and Sir Chaloner Ogle on the part of the naval forces and Generals Wentworth and Guise on the part of the army, together with the governor of the island, Edward Trelawny. The council, held at Santiago de la Vega (Spanish Town) is mentioned in Vernon's letter of May 30 to the Duke of Newcastle, printed in his *Original Papers relating to the Expedition to Carthagena*, London, 1744. (See pp. 126–128, 141.) But it is believed that the following minute of its determinations has never been printed. It is derived, by the courtesy of Dr. Herbert Friedenwald, Superintendent of the Manuscript Department in the Library of Congress, from the series of the "Vernon-Wager Navy Papers," in that library. This collection, bound in twelve large folio volumes, comprises many papers of great interest to students of colonial history.

It is perhaps unnecessary to recount the history of the expedition against Santiago de Cuba, resolved upon by this council of war. The military landed without opposition in the bay of Guantanamo, to which they gave the name of Cumberland, in honor of the royal duke. But on sending out parties to reconnoitre, Wentworth received such accounts of the difficulty of taking Santiago, that he judged it most prudent to withdraw. Vernon unwillingly acquiesced, and the expedition came to nothing.

The other paper is derived from the same source. It is believed that it has never been printed, and that it will be thought to be of present interest. The endorsement indicates it as not the work of Vernon, but of Stephen DeVere or Devereux. The two manuscripts are designated as Nos. 12 and 19, respectively, in Vol. VI. of the Vernon-Wager Papers.

I. COUNCIL OF WAR AT SANTIAGO DE LA VEGA, MAY 26, 1741.

At a General Council of War held at His Excellency Governour Trelawny's at S^t Iago de la Vega, on the 26^th day of May 1741.

Mr Vernon having communicated to us, together with His Majesty's Instructions of the 10th July 1740, and the additional Instructions from my Lords Justices of the 25th September 1740, the Letters and Orders since receiv'd from His Grace the Duke of Newcastle of the 4th December, and the two of the 28th Febr'y last, and likewise, all the intercepted Letters (so providentially fallen into his hands, by Capt Warren's destroying of Valladon the Privateer from St Iago)[1] and the Intelligence sent him by Capt Lee, and what was further observ'd of the motions of the Ships from Cadiz, by Captain Peyton of the Kennington, who was sent here by Capt Lee, with these Advices of the nine Sail Men of War putting to Sea from Cadiz.

And Governour Trelawny having communicated to us, the favourable Disposition of the Gentlemen of this Island, to contributing to the Success of any Expedition that might be judg'd proper to be undertaken.

Your Council of War after maturely deliberating on the said Instructions, Orders, Letters, intercepted Intelligences, and Advices, and having regard to the great reduction of our Forces;

It was the Opinion of the Council of War, that in regard to the Diminution of the Forces, the Security of this Island and our Trade, the Security of all Supplies coming to us, and preserving a Comunication with this Island, for our Supplies; the only Expedition that could be thought advisable to be undertaken, was against St Iago de Cuba, a Port of great Importance to the Security of our Trade, and cutting off the baneful Correspondence between them and Hispaniola.

And tho in regard to the general Sickness, that had spread itself thro' Fleet and Army, we were not in very good condition for undertaking any new Expedition; yet on the assurance given us by the Governour Trelawny, that we might rely on a Supply from the Island, of a thousand of the most serviceable of their Blacks, they could raise in the Island, to be all chosen Men, and to have proper Officers, and through a sincere Zeal for doing the utmost in our power, to answer the expectations of Our Royal Master, from the great Expence of this Expedition;

It was the Resolution of Your Council of War, to undertake this Expedition against St Iago, and to push it forward with all the dispatch, the Situation of our Affairs would admit of.

And Mr Vernon having desir'd our Opinions, on that part of his Instructions of the 25th September, in regard to dispatching a proportionable number of his Ships home on those of the Enemies being return'd home, or destroyed, and represented to us the hazard, the unsheath'd eighty Gun Ships, and others of the most crazy of the Ships, would run, if they were not sent home to save a Summer's passage; We concur'd with him in Opinion such ought to be dispatch'd home, so as a sufficient Force was reserv'd, in regard to the Spanish Squadron under Rodrigo de Torrez at the Havanna, and those mention'd to be under M. de Rochefeuil at Hispaniola.

---

[1] See Vernon's *Original Papers*, pp. 136, 137.

Given under our Hands at S^t^ Iago de la Vega the 26th day of May 1741.

E: Vernon
Tho^s^ Wentworth.
C: Ogle
J: Guise.

A Copy.

Since His Majesty's Forces have been so reduced by Sickness, I think the remaining number ought not to be hazarded, but on a Service that, if it succeed, may be of great Benefit and Importance to Great Britain.

I cannot think S^t^ Iago de Cuba of Consequence, while we are masters at Sea, and I think, it should be an inviolable Maxim, to be Superiours, as we may be, at Sea in the West Indies, or else, Possessions in the West Indies, will be a Detriment, instead of a Benefit, to Great Britain; and no Possessions but such as may be useful in Commerce, are for our Benefit.

Panama is of that nature, as it would command the Isthmus of Darien and therefore if there is Force enough, with the help of the Mosquito Indians, and Negroes under proper Officers from this Island, an Attempt upon that Place, would be in my Opinion most advisable.

Edw: Trelawny

A Copy.:

(Endorsed.)
General Council of War
held at S^t^ Iago de la Vega
the 26th May 1741, with Gov^r^
Trelawny's Reasons for
dissenting from it

II. SOME THOUGHTS RELATING TO OUR CONQUESTS IN AMERICA, JUNE 6, 1741.

Our success at Carthagena, says many a hearty Briton, will, if the blow be properly followd, make us masters of all Spanish America. Conquest is allowed to be a good title. If we keep what we conquer we shall have the Trade of all the Spanish West Indies in our own hands.

I am far from envying my Country so much Glory and Riches; but, I believe we shall have more of both if we limit our desires.

Admitting us in quiet possession of all Spanish America. To keep that possession we must do, as the Spaniards have done before us, we must have strong garisons and Colonies. This will estrange our hands and treasure, and we shall soon be in a worse condition than the Spaniards themselves.

Besides: Such a conquest, supposing us equal to the vast undertaking, will make us the Envy of our Neighbours. Attempting to engross trade is like aiming at universal monarchy; it will raise such a Confederacy against us, as we cannot withstand: A wise man would never grasp at what he cannot hope to hold.

What shall we do then, you will say, now we are masters of the American Seas? shall we plunder and destroy their towns, and lay all wast before us? By no means. This will be carrying on the war in a piratical barbarous manner, without benefit to any but to the adventurers. But by so doing shall we not the sooner compel the King of Spain to allow us a free navigation in the American seas without Search? Such cruelty may have a different offset. But if it should bring the Spaniards to a Treaty, and if a peace were made in the most explicit terms, yet we can have no hopes of its lasting long, without our having some cautionary town in our hands; and our having such a place in our hands will draw upon us the Envy of others. But may we not keep a town or two, and thence carry on a Seperate trade with the natives? The Spaniard will never consent to this: and the retaining such places by force, while the King of Spain continues Lord of America, will be attended with the same inconveniences, in proportion, as aiming at an entire Conquest. But may we not compell the King of Spain to open his ports in America, and give a free trade to all nations? and will not this take off the Envy of others? I believe none will envy us such a Romantic Enterprise, in which we can expect no Success, and if we had the greatest, it would not answer the purpose.

I am far from thinking that opening a free trade for all nations to the Spanish dominions in America would be of any injury to us. For whoever considers the Situation, and native riches of Great Britain and Ireland, and of our Colonies in America, can never think that we shall be out traded to Spanish America by any nation whatsoever, if we can have but the common discernment, not to obstruct our own trade.

I shall not take any pains to prove the advantage of our Situation, as being well known. And I shall but just mention two articles of our native riches, I mean food and manufactures: if these two articles be duly encouraged we shall out trade all the world in Spanish America. Nor do I think it impracticable to open all the ports of Spanish America, if a proper method were followed.

Supposing now that we had reduced the King of Spain to submit to an open trade to all his ports in America, and that he is still to continue King of his American dominions: all, in my opinion, that can be stipulated in this case is, that, instead of carrying goods from all parts of Europe to old Spain (w^ch goods, as the trade now lies, are to be carried thence, in the King of Spain's Ships, to his plantations in America) all nations shall be at liberty to carry their goods directly to his ports in America: that such a duty shall be paid by the importer, as shall be regulated: that a cautionary town, with a proper territory, shall be left in the hands of his Britanic majesty, and successors in trust for the due performance of this treaty: that the garison shall be maintained by an impost on all Ships touching there: and that all the naval powers of Europe shall be guarantees of this treaty.

The King of Spain, by such a treaty, being admitted to be absolute Sovereign of his American dominions, he must be allowed to govern those dominions in what manner he thinks fit, and, consequently, to keep up his viceroies, and all the rest of his officers, his garisons, and his fleets: and, in order to Support all this charge; the impost on goods imported directly into the ports of America must be very high, perhaps little inferior to the Indulto now laid on them in old Spain, and, if so the freetrader will receive but small benefit by this alteration in the chanel of trade.

Our keeping a cautionary town will give great offence to the naval powers of Europe. I doubt whether our friends the Dutch will allow of it.

But the great difficulty will be in reducing the King of Spain to submit to such conditions. For, by this Scheme, Spanish America is still to continue under the tyranny of old Spain, a tyranny they have long groaned under, and which they are ready to shake off, whenever they shall have a proper opportunity. But if they find that all intended by us, is only to chastise the King of Spain, and to suffer him still to Lord it over them, they will not give us the least assistance, and without the assistance of the Natives we can never expect to lay open the ports of new Spain; but, with their help, we shall do it, in spite of all the powers of Europe. And if we enter into alliance with them, as with free people, we shall have a new, and just title to carry on the war in defense of our allies, and therefore we may hope it will be prosperous

It well becomes a free people to place others in the same condition with themselves. To deliver so many nations from Tyranny will be truer Glory than Alexander gained by all his Victories. Let me add to this, that we shall thereby greatly increase our own Riches, w^ch^ is the end of all conquests: and we shall do it without raising the just envy of our neighbours, w^ch^ is likely to make our happiness the more lasting. Because, Spanish America being free, their trade, like that of other free nations, will be equally free to all in Amity with them. Even old Spain itself will find the benefit of it, if their pride will permit them to turn merchants.

This will not be the first time that the Subjects of the King of Spain recovered their liberties, and with our help. Our glorious Queen Elizabeth was the great instrument, under god, of making the poor distressed States a free people. Their own industry made them rich, and they are still our good allies. Our posterity may expect to find their best allies in Spanish America.

By Spanish America I mean not only the original Americans, but also the new Americans, or descendants from the Spaniards. Let them all be free: and let them all settle their own respective governments in what manner they shall think fit. The more Government the better. The Romans made use of this very method in helping Greece, when oppressed by the King of Macedon, and with success.

To set Spanish America thus free must needs be a great undertaking, and a work of time: but this ought not to discourage us: for the war will maintain itself: I mean that our trade to the ports first opened will bring us in wealth enow to support the war.

If we proceed upon this plan and in earnest, we may expect to meet with success abroad, and with, what is better, peace at home: So be it. June 6, 1741.

(Endorsed in a different hand.)
6 June 1741
Some Thoughts relating
to our Conquests in America.

(Endorsed in Vernon's hand)
Mr. Steph DeVeros.

2. *Letters to Caleb Strong, 1786, 1800.*

SOME years ago the Rev. S. C. Strong, a great-grandson of Caleb Strong, presented to the Historical and Natural History Society of South Natick, Massachusetts, a collection of letters addressed to his ancestor. They are now in the museum of that society, close by the site of John Eliot's Indian church. By the kindness of Mr. Gustavus Smith, president of the society, we are permitted to print the two following letters. At the time when the first letter was written, Caleb Strong (1745–1819) was a member of the Massachusetts senate. He was a member of the United States Senate (Federalist) from 1789 to 1796, and governor of Massachusetts from 1800 to 1807 and from 1812 to 1816. Theodore Sedgwick, who succeeded Strong in the Senate, and from 1799 to 1801 was Speaker of the House of Representatives, was in 1786 a member of the Continental Congress. His letter illustrates by an early instance the disunion sentiment of New England Federalists. The letter from Dwight Foster, Senator from Massachusetts 1800–1803, casts light upon those events of the election in South Carolina in 1800 which were illustrated by the series of letters printed in the last number of this REVIEW, pp. 111–129.

I. THEODORE SEDGWICK TO CALEB STRONG.

New York 6. August, 1786.

My dear Sir,

By the last post I had the pleasure to receive your letter of the 28th. ult. the contents convey evidence of such a disposition in my countrymen as must give pain to every well disposed mind.

The affairs of the continent are in such circumstances as afford no balance to the disorders of the particular states. Should Massachusetts fall into anarchy the great prop of the union would be prostrate. For altho the public conduct of Massachusetts when viewed by itself would not strongly inspire veneration, yet when compared with any other State in the union, the comparison will irresistably compel conviction that her councils produce measures more the result of wisdom and integrity than any other.

Our commissioners are returned from the *mediterranian* without effecting anything, no reasonable hope of any other event could have been formed. The interest of every commercial and maritime power in europe opposes ours as related to this object, and Great Britain, which is in strict friendship with the pirates would go great lengths in gratifying her malice and jealousy to defeat our purpose. congress have not yet come to any ultimate decision on this subject. I have formed my opinion as to policy in the object to be persued, but this must not at present be put on paper.

No reasonable expectations of advantage can be formed from the commercial convention.[1] The first proposers designed none. the measure was originally brought forward with an intention of defeating the enlargement of the powers of Congress. Of this I have the most decisive evidence. It well becomes the eastern and middle States, who are in interest one, seriously to consider what advantages result to them from their connection with the Southern States. They can give us nothing, as an equivalent for the protection which they derive from us but a participation in their commerce. This they deny to us. Should their conduct continue the same, and I think there is not any prospect of an alteration, an attempt to perpetuate our connection with them, which at last too will be found ineffectual, will sacrafice everything to a meer chimera. Even the appearance of a union cannot in the way we now are long be preserved. It becomes us seriously to contemplate a substitute; for if we do not controul events we shall be miserably controuled by them. No other substitute can be devised than that of contracting the limits of the confederacy to such as are natural and reasonable, and within those limits instead of a nominal to institute a real, and an efficient government.

This language will appear to you I am affraid as evidence of pusalanimity, but I do not think that in politics I am timid.

We have made another requisition which includes such part of the principal of the foreign debt as will become payable next year. to this measure I gave my assent not from any apprehension that it would produce any considerable effect, but because I wish congress may do her duty. Several of the States have never passed any acts in persuance of the requisition of 84, not half on that of last year and still less is to be expected from the present.

It will be unnecessary to inform you that this letter is wrote with great haste and in that confidence of your friendship which I have long flattered myself I was so happy as to possess. Some matters of very great importance but with regard to which secrecy at present is enjoined will detain me here a little longer. As soon as these are completed which I hope will be the case in 8 or 10 days I shall again return to the vale of private life. There confiding in the wisdom of Doctor Holten that all things will be happily adjusted I will seek contentment.—Compt^{s} I pray you to M^{rs} S.

---

[1] At Annapolis.

I am my dear Sir,
Your sincerely affec^{te}
THEODORE SEDGWICK

M^{r} Strong.

II. DWIGHT FOSTER TO CALEB STRONG.

City of Washington Dec. 12th 1800

My dear Sir,

I thank you for your Favour of the 29th ult^{o} which came to Hand in due course by the Mail. I was happy to learn that so much unanimity with honourable Principles had prevailed in the Legislature of Massachusetts in the appointment of Electors. If as You supposed the late Election had depended on Pennsylvania we had been safe. The opposition gained only the advantage of one Majority by the Electors in that State. Far more important was the Vote of South Carolina; all depended on the success of the federal Ticket at Columbia and there our last hopes have been defeated. The Election came on upon the 2nd inst. There were present 115 members of the House of Representatives and 36 of the Senate, making the whole number 151; of which 76 were a majority. The Tickets and numbers for each of the nominees were as follows.

Federal		Antifederal	
Gen'l Washington	69	Robert Anderson	85
John Ward	69	John Hunter	87
W^{m} Falconer	64	A. Simpkins	84
Col^{o} J. Postell	66	Wade Hampton	82
Capt. Blasingame	66	A. Love	82
Gen^{l} M^{c}Pherson	66	Theo. Gaillard	85
H^{y} Dana Ward	63	Paul Hamilton	87
Thomas Roper	67	Joseph Blythe	82

Mr. DeSaussure the Writer states that they could have easily formed a Ticket composed of Men who would have been appointed by a great Majority for the Election of Jefferson and Pinckney. Many who were extremely anxious to support Jefferson proposed to the Federalists to form a Ticket uniting the Interests of Jefferson and Pinckney being at the same time deeply reluctant to give up Gen^{l} P. but on the most mature Deliberation it was deemed the wisest and most honourable to adhere to the federal arrangements heretofore made for the equal support of Mr. Adams and Gen'l Pinckney.

The General is a Member of the Legislature and was present. he firmly resisted every Inducement to be associated with Jefferson at the Expense of Mr. Adams. Both he and our other Friends there have in the whole transaction behaved in the most honourable Manner. He has shown himself worthy of the Honours which we wished to have conferred upon him by his appointment to the office of Vice President. I hope it will appear that like honourable Principles, without a single Exception, have prevailed throughout New England. The successful Party in S° Carolina say that the Electors are pledged to support Jefferson and Burr! Such is the result and these are the Men who are to sustain the two most distinguished offices in the Federal Government. The Change is great; —but if we can avoid being conducted into a French Port we may esteem ourselves yet to be fortunate. I hope the danger may be avoided but if the War in Europe shall continue, the Danger will be imminent. It is of infinite moment to prevent the poison already too deeply infused in New England from becoming more virulent. The preservation of our ancient Institutions is an object of the first magnitude.

These by vigilence and attention may be preserved, and if they shall be we may yet stand on safe Ground.

With respect to our accommodations here they are much better than we expected to find. The settlement still is, and for a long Time must continue to be in a rude state. The Trees have been cut away and the Fences have been removed. the place bears more the appearance of an encamping ground than of a City. it is susceptible of Improvement, but I trust will never be brought to Perfection in the manner contemplated by many of those who favoured the Removal of the Government to this Place. I mean at the expense of the United States. There are several very good Houses and many small ones; but they are sparsely situate and the publick Buildings planted so far from each other that great Inconveniences are experienced.

I have written to Gen! Putnam relative to the Taxes on your shares in the Ohio Purchase and as soon as I can ascertain the amount, I will, according to your Request remit to him the money necessary to discharge them.

Mr. Hillhouse and I continue to be Fellow Lodgers. we have with us Messrs Chauncey and Elizur Goodrich Nathan Read and T. Foster, Mr. Nott of S° Carolina and Gen'l Dickson of N° Carolina, and we consider ourselves as very fortunate in having obtained Lodgings in a good House with an agreeable Family and near the Capitol.

I am Dear Sir with great
affection and Esteem Your
Friend and obed! Servant
DWIGHT FOSTER

His Excellency
Gov. Strong.

3. Letters to Secretary Chase from the South, 1861.

THE following letters are selected from those written to Salmon P. Chase during the year 1861. In two cases, Richard Ela, April 12, and T. D. Winter, June 10, the letters are reports made at Mr. Chase's special request. Mrs. Hunt was a sister of Mr. Chase's third wife, being married to Randall Hunt and resident in New Orleans. Most of the other letters are from men not among Chase's usual correspondents.

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART.

I. J. MCCORMICK TO CHASE.

Augusta Georgia
March 6–61

Salmon P. Chase
Hond Sir,

The responsible, and influential position you now occupy; and the threatening aspect of affairs, induces me as an old personal acquaintance, and one who has not been unfriendly to you, to address you.

I have been living in this City and State for the last twenty months, and have not been blind to what has taken place around me. I have been in contact with, and learned the opinions of all classes of people; I have noted the rise, progress and character, of the revolution which has taken place; and therefore can speak with knowledge, of what has been done; that which is; and the present determination as to the future; and entertaining the opinions which I do, I kneed not add, that I deeply deplore the present situation of affairs.

Sir, argue as much, and as wisely as we may, that, by the law of the Constitution, the whole territory of the U. S. of six months since, is yet the territory of the U. S.: in fact, it is not true.

In law, the thirteen colonies were a part of the British empire, until the peace of '83. In law Mexico, Bolivia, Peru were a part of the empire of Spain for twenty years after Spain had ceased to have any authority over them, or, more recently, Texas was in law a part of Mexico, until the treaty of Guadaloupe Hidalgo; yet in fact none of these legal propositions were true; and the existence of the mere legal abstract truths, did not falsify the material fact, that these several Colonies and States, were not a part of the governments from which they had separated themselves. The same principle which applied to them, applies equally to the seceding States which were recently a part of the empire of the U. S.

That the empire is severed, is a fact, in practical existence. That a new government, foreign to the government of the U. S. has been organized is a fact in practical existence. That this new government recognizes no right of control, in the government of the U. S. is a fact in practical existence; and these practical facts are hostile to, and subversive of the abstract legal fact, announced in the Inaugural address of the President of the U. S.

Let me assure you Sir; these practical existing facts will be maintained. If your mind is influenced by the idea, that the seceding States will again become a part of the U. S. until the experiment has been tried, and the minds of men are materially changed, disabuse yourself of it at once. There are not in the Confederate States, one thousand men, who will not sacrifice all—property, life, every thing but honor, or that which they believe to be honor, for the maintenance of their present position. In this I am not mistaken. True, there are many Union men in the South, many good, honest, honorable, patriotic men, who regret the separation; but the separation being made; they know, they seek for no alternative. They are with their State and the new government, and with them alone.

These things being so; it is for the U. S. to decide the momentous question of peace or war, now impending; and you Sir, are one of those who must make that decision.

If you should determine for the latter; and the enforcement of the laws is such a determination; you enter upon a terrible contest, a contest at war with every principle of self-government and every recognized American principle of political rights, and combat the principles, for which you yourselves contend. This is much, but more remains.

Sir, you cannot conquer the South. You may destroy her prosperity; you may annihilate her people, but you cannot conquer them. You may launch your troops upon her, you may batter down her cities, you may carry fire, rapine and murder among her peaceful dwellings, and by this annihilation you may obtain a jurisdiction over her territory, but it will be a jurisdiction over nothing but ruins.

To a good man, a proposition fraught with such consequences, must be horrible. Barbarism or savage fanaticism alone, could exult over it; and I will not believe you are in any manner allied to the latter without convincing proof of a fact so revolting.

In this picture I have granted your power in arms, not because the fact is so; but because its discussion is unnecessary. But I grant it for the results; and what are they? I have said what they would be to the South; to you, they would be, a bankrupt government, a ruined commerce, impoverished States and a demoralized people. With these facts staring you in the face, having destroyed the South, will you have any cause for rejoicings at home?

In Gods name let there be peace, Settle the affair amicably. Let the language of Abraham to Lot control your councils, and although clouds may lour for a while, there will be sunshine hereafter. We cannot hope to make this a real land of Beula; but near approaches are not denied to us.

You have ever said I was too violent; will you not permit me to caution you against violence now? and believe me Sir to be with the highest consideration, Yours, &c.

J. McCormick.

II. RICHARD ELA TO CHASE.

Washington 12" April 1861

Sir:

In compliance with your request, I respectfully submit the following statement of the state of political feeling at the Southwest as far as it came under my observation during my late visit to Mobile and New Orleans.

My business in that region was of a private character, arising from the estate left by lately deceased brother who had been for more than twenty years a trader at Mobile, and who had named me Executor of his will. During the ten days I was in that city, that estate occupied my attention and brought me into contact with many individuals of various classes and pursuits.

I was very much surprised at the apparent unanimity of that population in support of the secession policy. For some months past I have been generally aware of the professed alarm of people from the South in regard to their rights and property—but I was unprepared to find such a unanimity among them. Without in any instance having introduced conversation on political subjects, I think every person with whom I had business in Mobile, addressed me questions as to the probable course of the Government at Washington towards the South. My reply to such questions was, that I had no means of knowing the intention of the Government beyond the views expressed in the Presidents inaugural address, and the course of its supporters during the late session of Congress—that I did not believe the Government contemplated any hostile measure, but it was bound to execute the laws as far as practicable.

Sometimes this led to further discussions the particulars of which it is impossible for me to recollect and state. The upshot was, that every person with whom I held conversation, whether originally from the North or South, expressed the firmest determination to support the Confederate States, as the only mode of preserving their rights and property. Perhaps the best mode of giving you a general idea of the mixture of argument and feeling which pervaded their conversations, will be the endeavor to state the leading points of a discussion I had with one of the most enterprising and successful traders at Mobile, like my brother a native of New Hampshire who had been on the most intimate social relations with him for many years. He is a private gentleman with whose frankness and practical views I had been most favorably impressed, and I accordingly took occasion to lead him into a full expression of his opinions, which I now give the substance of, though not intended by him to be repeated.

He remarked that for himself he was most anxious that relations of peace and amity should be preserved between the North and South, which he now regarded as wholly impossible under one Government. That the people of the North had been gradually brought to the settled and conscientious belief that slavery was the most abominable of all sins in the sight of God and man, while the people of the South sincerely believed that it was the most benificent of all forms of servile labor and its protection was essential to the public and private prosperity of that region. With these radically conflicting views he said it was preposterous to suppose that one Government would satisfy both sections, and the best course was for them to seperate peaceably, and each section pursue its own path of duty and interest. That the present administration had been brought into power solely by the feeling of hostility to the institutions of the South, and that section did not intend that the Congress of the United States should usurp the power exercised by the National Convention of France and make their country another S^t^Domingo. Abolitionism had obtained a majority of votes, and got the control of the General Government of the United States—there was then no alternative for the South but to secede from the Union. Self preservation had compelled secession. He was neither a lawyer nor metaphysician and did not know, or care, whether under the Constitution, the States had or had not a right to secede—it was sufficient for him, that the election of the present administration upon the doctrines, and by the efforts of the abolitionists, was in fact a revolution—he was willing to accept it and abide by the consequences of resisting its government.

I remarked that so far from the present Government being under the control of abolitionists, it seemed to me as certain as any thing that could be known of any man's private opinions, that the President was not an abolitionist, nor even any of the members of his cabinet so far as I could understand. That even were such their opinions, under the Constitution no law could be passed by Congress, which would affect slave property in the States.

He replied that he did not assert that the President was an abolitionist—he did not pretend to know whether he or any of his cabinet were or were not—but the point was, they had been brought into power by abolition principles and votes, and this was enough to justify secession by the South. That the result had proved that the South were correct in taking that step. The administration had been compelled whether abolitionists or not, to bestow some of its most important appointments on persons who had no public character or standing except as abolitionists, and their measures would of necessity be of the same hue. As to constitutional power, it was not worth while to speak of that, when the positive obligation to surrender fugitive slaves could not be enforced from the state of public feeling in the North. Under that feeling, there could be no safety from continual encroachment on the rights and property of the South. At any rate said he, we have determined not to expose ourselves to such hazards. We intend to protect ourselves, if it costs everything we have.

I enquired whether the views he expressed were generally entertained by the people of Mobile?

He replied that he was regarded as he believed, to be an exception from the moderation of his opinions, and his desire to preserve peace. It could not be otherwise with him, as his principal connexions in business were with the North. Many earnest, impressible people were in favor of immediate and active war, until the North were willing to cease their abuse of, and interference with, Southern institutions, with which they had no concern or responsibility. For himself, he was wholly opposed to hostilities except in self defense. But should the administration at Washington attempt to collect revenue here, a bloody war is inevitable, as the South will choose to be exterminated to the last man, rather than submit to such a state of things.

The foregoing brief exposition of the views of this gentleman, is according to my best recollection of their substance during a conversation of more than an hour. From the conversation and remarks I heard in Cars, at Public Houses and other places of general resort during my passage through and sojourn in the Cotton States it seemed to me that his views were among the most moderate and measured I noticed, after crossing the line of Tennessee. While in Mobile I had occasion to visit several respectable families, and it struck me that the females from all I saw and heard, were quite as earnest and zealous as the men.

This state of things so much to be regretted, seems to be general in the Cotton States, so far as I had means of judging of the tone of public opinion. In Alabama Mississippi and Louisiana which I traversed, not an expression in favor of the Union came under my notice except what was made by myself in the various conversations I held. Every where in those States, the people appeared to be enthusiastic in favor of the seperate government of the Confederate States.

While at Mobile I accidentally met Mr. Cobb, late Secretary of the Treasury on his way from Montgomery to New Orleans. He appeared rejoiced to see me, carried me to his room and conversed freely on the policy of the Confederate States until interrupted by the calls of several gentlemen. From the tenor of his remarks it was evident that he did not consider resumption of the former connections between the seceded States and the United States to be expedient or practicable. From all I saw and heard it seems to me that it will not be brought about, until the Seceded States shall have fully experienced the charges and responsibilities of separate Government.

Very respectfully
Your obed Sert
RICHARD ELA

Hon. S. P. Chase
Secretary of the Treasury.

III. MRS. RANDALL HUNT TO CHASE.

New Orleans May 30th 1861.

My dear Brother

I have determined to avail myself of the oppertunity offered by the few days of grace, yet remaining before mails are closed, to write to you once more.

First, let me thank you for your prompt and kind answer to my former letter. I did not reply to it, because I had nothing to write that could interest you, beyond what was in the newspapers. I did not have it published because there was nothing in it calculated to satisfy or quiet the discontented or excited people.

There was something in your letter however, so practical and bearing so directly on the course which should be pursued at present by the United States, that I have frequently thought I ought perhaps to present it to your continued reflection.—Pardonnez moi. I would not appear presumptuous, I desire only to suggest.

What I refer to in your letter, is your condemnation of the attempt to delude the people, as to the settled opinion of any part of the country, and of the folly of evasion. "Let us," you say, "recognize facts as they are, frankly and boldly, and not creep away from them."

You have an enlarged and cultivated mind. The times call for the highest exercise of patriotism and statesmanship. The question which you have in a good degree to determine is, shall the country have peace or war? war, not with a foreign enemy, but civil and fratricidal war, the most cruel and bloody that history will ever know; bringing poverty, ruin famine and vice in its horrid train. Do not delude yourself or others with the notion that war can maintain the Union. Alas I say it with a heavy heart, the Union is destroyed, it can never be restored. If indeed the federal government had frowned upon the first dawning of disunion, things might have been different: But the U. S. suffered South Carolina to secede without opposition, and with scarcely a murmur of disapprobation. Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Texas, in a word all the Southern States, with the exception of Kentucky Missouri and Maryland, have joined in the secession, and have formed themselves into a powerful confederacy of States, with a government possessing all the usual powers of sovereignties, exercising entire and exclusive sway, legislative, executive, and judicial, within the limits of those states, and dissolving all connection with the U. S. Having thus by a revolution hitherto almost bloodless, assumed and exercised the right of self-government, the Confederate States are now threatened with war and desolation, if they do not abjure the government they have formed, and renounce forever the right of altering or abolishing that government, no matter how oppressive or despotic it may become.

The time has passed for a discussion about the territories, and fugitive slaves, and the constitutional right of a state to secede. Secession has proved to be a revolution, the overthrow of the constitution, the dissolution of the Union. Still secession is *un fait accompli*. Disunion is a fixed fact. It is worse than useless to deny or attempt to evade this truth.

The question then to be determined, is not, shall the Union be maintained, but, shall the Confederate States be allowed to govern themselves? And this is a question of liberty and free government.

And how do the statesmen of the North, how do you my dear Brother, who should recognize facts as they are, propose to deal with this question? With sword and buckler, the rifle, the bayonet, and the musket, the cannon and all the dread instruments of war! with infantry, and cavalry, and ships, and navies, and armies.

With these you propose to subjugate the entire free people of the

South, while you mock them, with the declaration that your object is to maintain a Union, which no longer exists. Is this wise, just, quite in keeping with the spirit of christianity and of liberty, and with the lofty character of the U. S.? Would you desire a union of compulsion—a union to be maintained by the bayonet—a union with hatred and revenge filling the hearts of the North, and of the South. I hope you would not. But if you would the thing is impossible. You can never subjugate the South—never. Her people are highspirited martial and intelligent. Educated in the school of American liberty, they value the right of self government above all price, they believe that governments are instituted among men to secure the life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that their just powers are derived from the consent of the governed. They view the attempt to conquer them, and compel them to submit to the gov't. of their victors as an effort of high-handed tyranny and oppression. You may for the moment have an advantage in wealth and numbers: But the South (and especially this part of the South) has the advantage of a climate which is death to northern soldiers, while it is health giving to the Southern. Besides the North is fighting for subjugation and domination, the South for liberty and independence. It is precisely like the great revolutionary struggle of '76 against the tyranny of G. B. —a struggle for liberty on one side, and for despotism on the other. How can you expect victory in such a cause? You know the power and resources of the South, her agricultural products her cotton tobacco sugar, the extent and fertility of her soil, the number of her inhabitants, the intimate connection of her interests with the industrial interests of Europe. England and France are already sympathising with her, and watch for an opportunity of acknowledgeing her sovereignty and independence. Her armies in the field equal your own in numbers, and are under the command of able and renowned officers. Surely eight millions of people, armed with the holy cause of liberty in such a country as they possess, are invincible by any force the North can send against them. Suppose what is not probable—suppose you should gain a victory, or two or more over the South, do you imagine that this would lead the way to submission? No, believe me, it might lead to a guerilla warfare, to a warfare like that carried on in former days by Marion and Sumpter and others who were content to live in swamps and fastnesses coming out as occasion offered to attack the invaders of their soil, and finally driving them off and gaining liberty. But there would be this difference. The South is now united to a man. There is no division among the people here. There is but one mind, one heart, one action. Do not suffer yourself to be misled with the idea, that there are union men in the South. There is not a man here who will not resist the arms of the North. The action of Mr. Lincoln and his cabinet has made them all of one mind.

I will tell you what I see here in the City. Every night the men are drilling. Young and old, professional men and laborers, lawyers, docters, and even the ministers are all drilling. The shops are closed at six that the clerks may go to their drilling. The ladies hold fares make clothes lint etc. for the army, and animate the men by appeals to their chivalry and their patriotism to resist the enemy to the death. What is seen in N. O. pervades the whole South. Never were a people more united and more determined. I solemnly believe that if the war now scarce begun shall go on, the North will suffer as much, if not more than the South, and they will finally be compelled to acknowledge the independence of the latter.

Why not do this then at once? Why not separate in peace? Why not avoid all the dreadful evils of this war?

You will wonder I suppose why I am writing to you who are so much abler than I to form a correct judgement in this matter, but I want you to know the feelings of the Southern people, and not to take council alone with narrow minded men of one idea, men who see nothing but the freedom of the negro, in the destruction of a noble country, and the overthrow of a noble government. Think of this, and what my feelings must be with my nearest and dearest relatives and friends arrayed against each other in a contest for Liberty.

I have always loved and respected you. Your abilities and character enable you to exercise a great, if not a controlling influence over the policy of the U. S. It was reported some six weeks ago that you were in favor of letting the South go in peace. I hope the report is true, and that you will exert yourself to ward off the calamity of war. If you succeed in the effort the country will bless you. Your name will be familiar as a household word and go down from generation to generation, and religion and liberty will ever hail you as their champion.

I close this appeal to you my dear Brother. I have not done justice to the subject. My heart and mind suggest many things more, but I will not tire you further.

Mr. Hunt has gone up to the camp to take leave of his brother and his nephew who are ordered off to-morrow. I suppose my own dear brothers will soon go off to fight and perhaps to fall in this cruel wicked war. Oh God help us.—The authors of it will be cursed from many an aching heart ere long.

Give my love to my dear little Nettie, and to Kate. I hoped this spring to have fitted up the dear old Station to pass our summers there. Its doors would have been as hospitable as in former days. I hoped to have passed many a happy day there with my relations. And I assure you that you and your children were among the happiest anticipations. But my chateaux en Espagne have been rudely thrown to the ground. If we women were at the helm of state our tender hearts would have settled these difficulties long before it came to this.

Farewell. Listen I pray you to my entreaty. It is not my prayer alone, it is the echo of every American heart. May God enlighten you and lead you in the paths of wisdom, virtue and liberty.

Very truly and affectionately yours

R. L. H.

IV. T. D. WINTER TO CHASE.

Washington City June 10/61

Hon Salmon P. Chase
Secretary of the Treasury
Sir

I have taken an early opportunity at your request to lay before you a Statement of the Condition of Affairs in those portions of the Seceded States which I have had occasion to be thrown into during the past few months, and in so doing I shall give you the facts as near as my personal observation has been able to glean and which reaches as late a period as the first of the present month, on all points bearing on the political, commercial and military condition of those portions of the secession States which I have been in, together with the Topography of those portions of the States which in future may be needed as the Channels for the Transportation of Troops into the disaffected States.

When I arrived in Memphis last fall I found the political feeling in that city strongly Union, and ardently advocating the claims of Mr. Bell for the Presidency; with but one Exception I think the press of that city were with the Union party except the Memphis Avalanche, which has always been extremely Secession in its view.

Political Feeling

After the Presidential Election which placed Mr. Lincoln as President Elect before the people, the Union men and the Union Press although defeated in their great object, strongly opposed the feeling of secession, that seemed to be gaining ground, and though they felt no sympathy with the administration yet they strongly recommended that the administration have a fair commencement and that if the just rights of the South was conceded they could live as well under a Republican administration as any other. This position was maintained until even after all the other states had gone out with the Exception of Virginia, and when she seceded and the evacuation of Fort Sumpter took place, and still later until Mr. Bell made his wonderful leap into the Secession Ranks when the Union press placed the secession Flag at the head of their Columns.

With all the array of the press of Tennesee against the Union I do not think it has changed the sentiment of a large number of its patrons; I do know that in the City of Memphis and in the State there are yet a good number of citizens, who are deeply devoted to the Union, and if they cannot express their sentiments outwardly they will, or have already done so within a day or two past at the Ballot Box, provided Mob Law has not reigned supreme, which I am much afraid will be the case in Memphis. The class of men as a general thing who advocate the doctrine of Secession as far as I have been able to see are men who have nothing to lose and everything to gain; who have had the truth kept from them, and the impression instilled into their minds that the Northern States together with the administration are endeavoring to ruin them, and deprive them of all rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

That they have been deeply misled by their vile leaders, and their minds poisoned by the statements daily set forth by the organs of that party is well known. But my firm belief is that should an army formidable enough to control as they went, march into the South and show to the masses that they came only to execute the laws and protect their *slave* property the current of feeling would change materially, and there are *many* Union men in East and West Tennesee and Northern Alabama who will do their utmost in assisting the troops in carrying out the laws of the Country.

Let the ringleaders of this organization be laid hold of and the rest will soon subside

Commerce and Supplies

In a commercial point of view Memphis is a point that has been steadily increasing in trade, but the present state of affairs has completely prostrated her markets, and when I left there little or nothing was doing compared to what it was last fall The quantity of Cotton on hand was but small and the season being over, that portion of the trade will be dull until the new crop comes in

The condition of the provision market begins to excite more serious thought than anything else; they tell you that they have any quantity of provisions, but on an examination that I made in most of the provision Houses I should judge the stock very limited, and if the Louisville market is not supplying them, which they will not do without the Cash in advance and that in Kentucky funds or gold and silver, I see no source from which they can draw their supplies, for New Orleans has none to spare

Fresh Beef is not plenty, and what there is, is only a middling quality

Your early and prompt action in issuing orders to the officials at Cairo for the Seizure of all articles that would in any measure assist the South has very much retarded their operations for I do know that Thousands of Dollars worth of provisions had been ordered from St. Louis which has been their principal market and could they have gained a few weeks more, would have given them an opportunity to have laid in such a stock of Salt provisions as would have lasted them for months, and supplies of Ammunition they were depending upon are now in our hands.

I hold the idea that Memphis is the most important point we could obtain and that from its high location and the amount of Forest which surrounds it, no more eligable Spot Could be found for the quartering of the troops than that point, and I do not think the heat any greater than at Cairo, while it is exempt from the fogs and miasmas and damp dews which morning and evening rises over that point.

Number and Disposition of Troops

When I left Memphis there was not military force in the city except the "Home Guard" which is composed of Infantry and Cavalry.

The encampments are at the following places

Germantown on M and C R R	4000	Troops
Corinth " " " " "	8000	"
Union City on M and O R R	4500	"
Jackson " " "	8000	"
Fort Wright and Randolph	2500	"
At Camp Rector opp Mem 2 Reg	27000	

I think the Numbers are somewhat less but it will not vary a great deal from above statement

Some of the troops which left were comfortably equipped, while many had no military clothing, their arms were mostly what was taken from the Baton Rouge and Little Rock Arsenals, and were the old flint locks altered to Percussions.

I saw no Minnie or Maynard Rifles except in private hands

Two companies who came on the same train with me as far as Union City were a very unsoldierly set of men and badly officered

The best appearing and best drilled Regiments as far as I have seen are the Mississippi Regt, but None of them have the stamina or soldierly bearing that marks the companies that I have Seen Since my return North

My opinion is that our soldiers have far the advantage of them in discipline strength and better officers.

The Topography of the Country

As to that portion of the Country which will be of any particular interest, and over which I have travelled, I could see no great obstacles to overcome

From Memphis to Humboldt over the Memphis and Ohio R R is 81 miles through woods with here and there scattered plantations only 1 bridge about 175 feet long over the Big Hatchie River balance small trestle works, no heavy Grades on roads From Humboldt to Columbus City is 62 miles, country woody, no great impediments

Fort Randolph and Wright are bluffs projecting into the River. At Fort Randolph there are some heavy guns.

I know no other points at present that I could give that would be of importance; but I would say this, in the valley of the Mississippi we hold 2 Important points Cairo and Birds Point; Columbus City should be in our hands, but I look upon the occupation of Memphis, at an early day as one of the most important movements that could be made, and one that would do much to quell the turbulent spirits of the South West

Very Respectfully
Your obt Servt
T D Winter

There may be other points coming up in my mind which I cannot now think of and which should I deem it of sufficient importance I will communicate to you.

T D W

V. E. F. DRAKE TO CHASE.

Louisville Ky. 29. Aug. 1861.

Hon. S. P. Chase,
My Dear Sir:

I have been spending a day or two here, with ample opportunity to note the condition of things. The peace of Kentucky is in great peril, and everything indicates an outbreak. It is not improbable that the Legislature will be broken up. I have just seen Mr. Wolfe, one of the staunchest union members, and he evidently feels much anxiety on the subject. A Secession barbecue will be held near Frankfort on the day the Legislature meets, at which the old state guard (secesh) will be present armed. The Union men are conscious of inability for want of arms and organization to defend themselves, and are inquiring anxiously how many men are in Ohio and Ind^{a} within reach. I do not think you, in Washington are really aware of the extent of the danger in this quarter. If the late vote of Ky is relied on, as an indication of the strength of the union party it will deceive you. The vote showed a large majority, but when carefully considered it will be found that nearly all the old men are Unionists at heart and in action while their sons, living in their fathers' houses are heading rebellion There is another large class, who sympathize with the rebels, yet from policy vote and talk Union, and almost *every* union man considers the *South* aggrieved, and expects an end of the war only by agreeing to any demand by way of guarantee which the South may demand. If Jef. Davis' government would to day proffer a suspension of hostilities on any terms (even terms impossible for us to accept) and we should reject them, Kentucky would be a unit against us. I am sure that Kentucky is only a Union State for fear of the consequences of being the seat of war as a border Confederate State. The recent army reverses, have done much to weaken us both here and in Ohio. The people cannot understand why we fight everywhere with an inferior, opposed to a superior force. The Government is considered to blame for this. Another matter—the impunity of rebellion surprises us. The country swarms with traitors. They are daily taken in the very act—and yet none are punished. The arm of Government seems alike powerless to punish enemies or protect friends. Even the public proclamation to punish pirates is not carried out. If the Government would promptly punish all active treason, even by a bold stretch of power, it would give us great strength. When arms are shipped to Lexington from Cin[cinna]ti, let men be at hand to arrest all who resist and resistance would soon cease. In the recent case when a Cynthiana mob turned back the Govt. arms nothing has been done to punish the traitors. Next time they will *take* the arms, growing bold by the apparent weakness of Government. Let the experiment be made of punishing treason and our true friends will rally around the President, while now they stand coldly doubting what to do. Here in Louisville the Hotels are filled with men from the South, actively concocting trouble, and smuggling supplies South. A Supt of a leading R R. in Mississippi has been here three weeks, planning to get 40 bbls. grease, South, to lubricate the car wheels, and a few days since he shipped from N. Albany what he desired—for *St. Louis!!* He had the cargo *attached* and put ashore at Paducah—and to-day he has it in use on his road. This statement is a fact. The rebels below are suffering for many things. Coffee at Memphis is 45^{cts} per lb. Salt is very scarce. Tin, lead, powder almost exhausted. Leather out of market. Money they have none, and if the business through Louisville could be reduced to non-intercourse with the South, and all trade cut off, more could be expected than the march of a large army could accomplish. In closing, I beg again to urge upon your attention the precarious condition of things here. A force should be near at hand for any emergency. The only apology I have to make for intruding on your time to read this, is my desire that you shall be informed of what is passing here. You will of course put your own estimate upon its value.

With great Respect Yours, E. F. DRAKE

VI. R. MCMURDY TO CHASE.

Frankfort, Ky.,
June 14, 1861.

My Dear Sir:

I have just returned from a tour, through Ohio, New York and New England and portions of Kentucky, designed to place the people of these sections more in direct sympathy with each other and communicate the feelings and sentiments of the North to their brethren of K–y, and, in K–y I have been visiting quietly several nominating conventions for Congress, to secure if possible the nomination of the most ultra-Union men for Congress, so that Mr. Lincoln may have the fullest moral support from Ky. Wadsworth of the Maysville District, Menzies of the Covington District, Mallory of the Louisville District and, indeed, the nominees of all the districts are taking bold and decided ground to vote supplies and to sustain the Union unconditionally, except Crittenden and one other nominee. This district (Crittenden's) is the most tainted with Secession, except that adjoining Tennessee. Mr. Crittenden is using, in his speeches, what he conceives to be the best policy for him to carry the district, but some of us think it a mistake. They who are helping to canvass the district take bold and decided positions, and the Union men of this district can not be excelled, in the fulness of their position and the heartiness of their zeal. Mr. Crittenden in private conversation goes full length and will do right. The addresses of the Border Conference held here do not come up, by any means, to the measure of public sentiment. The Union men care nothing for them and are continually preparing to fight and not argue this case farther, with the Secessionists. Moorehead does no mischief here by his position, for his private intercourse shows that he is a Union man and the people know that his possessions in Mississippi are threatened with confiscation, unless he appeases the demon of Secession.

If not before the 20th June certainly after the Embargo at Louisville sh^d be perfected. I know it is claimed by the Union men, that the high prices paid for transportation and produce, are draining the South and thus more embarrassing the enemy. While it is true that something is effected in this way, much more embarrassment and annoyance w^d be effected by a perfect embargo—much more money would find its way, by circuitous land routes for provisions, at greater expense for provisions. The South must have bacon, during the summer or die of the summer diseases. There is a great scarcity and great complaint among the people of New Orleans. A leading merchant of New Orleans just from there, at my house, informs me that butter is now $1 per lb, flour $20 per bbl. and ice high and scarce. He anticipates, by 6 mos., if the blockade and embargo are not modified, a food insurrection of the poorer classes of New Orleans.

I see by telegrams, that Brazil is being tampered with by the Secessionists. You will recollect that I advised you 6 mos. ago that I knew that this was done and I know that the process is still going on. No country is more important to us than Brazil in many respects, and from my residence there and close study for years of her interest and policy there is no country, under intelligent and judicious management, w^d more readily be in union with us. Now Brazil is allied to and in sympathy with England. I have earnestly desired that the right men sh^d have been sent to Brazil, for the sake of our own country, for her own sake, and for humanity's sake. I feel that I advised you in time, when propositions were made to myself to be one of 3 agents to operate on that country. No country is feared so much as a competitor in cotton, by the South as Brazil. I rejoice that the Portuguese minister has been exposed in time, if guilty of treason.

As I wrote before the arms and companies of the State are gradually falling into the hands of the Union men. The Banks of the State generally refuse to loan money to the Commission appointed by the legislature and money can not be obtained elsewhere. The Governor is controlled by the 4 Union men on the Commission. Buckner is almost forced to resign his position as Brigadier Genl. of the State Guard. it must come however—and then by election the next officer is Col. Crittenden, a Union man. The Secessionists feel utterly defeated, but are looking for something to turn up. They are canvassing now under the banner of armed neutrality. Breckinridge is broken, demoralized, drunken half the time and is failing continually to meet his appointments. His power is waning rapidly with his own partisans even.

The best measure for Kentucky is for the Virginia Federal forces to proclaim that runaway slaves are becoming so numerous that they can not notice them in any way, either to return them or to protect them, unless the property of Union men, and that the Secessionists hereafter must take care of their own property or it will be an entire loss. It occurs to me that slaves being worth more in Virginia than land that the masters w^d colonize, sell, and place for sale all their slaves in the Cotton

States under such regimen and thus Virginia be rapidly made a free state without trouble or discussion, or the springing up of subsequent political issues to disturb the administration, on this subject. It w.^d have a great effect to remove them at once from Ky and Missouri. Let it be understood quietly among the slaves of the traitors that they can run where they may, it w.^d settle the business. Butler has done well to start with. He can do better.

I am just informed by a traitor from Arkansas, on his way to Richmond, in arms that he himself personally knows of two companies of Indians being at Harper's Ferry, and that he himself came along with Flournoy and several companies of Cherokee Indians. There is no doubt of this at all. I thus speak positively for it has been doubted by some Northern presses.

I do trust that the present Congress will not adjourn in July, until Judge Munroe, our Federal District Judge is removed. Almost every one w.^d hail it with delight. Judge Catron, a true Union man, w.^d appear before any committee on the subject—and when it was proposed to arraign before him a man for treason, in advance he proclaimed what he w.^d do to protect the traitor. His family is the nucleus of Secession here and his son, Secretary of State, is editor of the famous Lexington Secession paper. The present judicial arrangements for Ky. c.^d be, by statute, I suppose annulled, the courts abolished and Judge Munroe w.^d cease to be a judge thereby. Is there not precedent for this? and then there c.^d be two districts made in Kentucky and two Union men appointed. We must have a court, where treason will not be encouraged. Traitors w.^d feel less secure.

If in any way I can do more than I am doing for the Gov.^t advise me. The Dioceses of the Seceded States meet July 3 at Montgomery, Al. If you wish secret service for the Gov.^t in that direction I sh.^d not hesitate to venture, knowing that this w.^d afford sufficient excuse, but in any manner command me, for I feel that, in any future, no such opportunity to do good for the entire world may never occur again.

Yours Truly,
R. McMurdy.

VII. GARNETT DAVIS TO CHASE.

Frankfort, 3 Sept. 1861.

Hon. S. P. Chase
Dear sir:

The proclamation of Gen. Fremont reached here yesterday, and is most inopportune for the Union party. I reached here Sunday morning. We had for some days before been with the leading members of the legislature and other prominent union men of the state, arranging our movements and measures of the session, and had about completed them when the proclamation fell amongst us with pretty much the effect of a bomb shell. The slavery feature of the proclamation is greatly objected to by our friends, and has greatly disconcerted, and I fear has scattered us. We should have passed all our measures but for it, now I have serious doubts if we pass any of them. There is a very general, almost universal feeling, in the state against this war being or becoming a war against slavery. The position of the secessionists in this state has been all the time that it is, and this proclamation gives them the means of further and greatly pushing that deception. I do not care about it myself except as it may be used to pervert public opinion and disturb the counsels of union. It has caused me despondency for the first time for Ky. I wish it had not been made until this legislature had done its business and adjourned.

I know that the general principle of the martial law is that rebels forfeit all their estate and property, but many able men believe that this principle is so far modified by the constitution as to have no effect for a longer time than the life of the rebel. The martial law forfeits as well the life of all rebels, but it is not possible to execute this principle in all and every case. To a large extent not only policy, but necessity requires the application of the rule to be omitted. Would not the same considerations of policy at least require a relaxation of the forfeiture as to slaves?

You will pardon me for a single suggestion. Thousands and tens of thousands had no knowledge, not even suspicion, that they would incur a forfeiture of their property by arraying themselves against the government. Ought not the administration to issue a proclamation setting forth these principles and consequences, and give all people opportunity to return to their duty and save themselves.

Your obedient servant,
Garnett Davis.

NOTE

New Haven, October 4, 1898.

To the Editor of the American Historical Review:

Dear Sir:

While looking for something else, I to-day discovered, in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, Vol. XXIII, p. 6, (1753) Sir Isaac Newton's "Table of the Assays, Weights, and Values, of Foreign Silver and Gold Coins, Made at the Mint" (1703), to which I referred in the foot-note on page 607 of your last volume. I doubt not that persons interested in the subject will be glad to have a reference to the original document, which, as I there stated, I had never been able to find or obtain.

Yours very truly,
W. G. Sumner.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

The Origin and Growth of the English Constitution. An Historical Treatise in which is drawn out, by the Light of the most recent Researches, the gradual Development of the English Constitutional System, and the Growth out of that System of the Federal Republic of the United States. By HANNIS TAYLOR, LL.D., late Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to Spain. In two parts. Part II. The After-growth of the Constitution. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1898. Pp. xliv, 645.)

THIS is an imposing work published in excellent fashion, printed with clear type on good paper, with wide margins, having a marginal analysis and copious foot-notes, an analytical table of contents filling forty-two pages and an index of forty-nine pages for both volumes. A few typographical errors are noticed: on p. 156, 1551 for 1552; p. 178, estate for state; p. 191, toun for tourn; p. 449, n. 4, masked for unasked.

After a brief review of the preceding period, this volume takes up the subject at the accession of Henry VIII. and carries it down to the formation of Lord Salisbury's cabinet in 1897. The style is good, many points are admirably stated, and the summaries are well done, as, for example, that of the gradual growth of ministerial responsibility; but the book, in many respects, is disappointing.

In the first place there is no bibliography, an inexcusable lack in a modern work on history, and, although the references in the foot-notes are very numerous, there is no explanation of abbreviations nor any indication of the editions used. Also, in the sources from which the material is taken, both volumes are disappointing. In the first volume the author relies more on Freeman than on Stubbs, though he calls the latter, very rightly, "the master of the constitutional history of the Middle Ages," while the statements of Freeman are being discredited more and more by the later and more critical work of Round and Maitland, to say nothing of Ashley and Seebohm. Even where Stubbs is used, the most scholarly characteristics of his work, his scientific reserve, careful qualifications and conservative judgments, are so entirely obliterated that the impress of truth and accuracy of the original vanishes from the copy. In the second volume, also, we fail to find those references to "the latest researches—English, German, French, and American," which we were promised in the preface to the first volume as well as on the title-page. There are many references to the original sources, more than in the first volume, but we discover no reference to Prothero's or Gardiner's valuable collections of select documents with their learned prefaces, on the later Tudor and the Stuart periods. References to Gneist are made only to his two works which have been translated into English, while for many parts of this volume his untranslated work is the most valuable. Nor is any reference made to French writers. Although a great deal of attention is given to the Church, no reference is made to Child's *Church and State under the Tudors*, to Perry's *English Church History*, or to that ablest contribution which has yet appeared on this subject, Makower's *Constitutional History of the Church of England.*

In general the author refers to the narrative more than to the constitutional historians. Burnet, Macaulay, Gardiner, Green and even Froude and Knight are quoted more than Hallam and May, while the admirable little book by Feilden, a model of conciseness and general accuracy, is not mentioned. The authors who are cited, however, are used very freely and long quotations from books easily accessible succeed each other at frequent intervals.

The work does not really carry out the purpose indicated on the title-page and in the preface to the first volume. Except in the general introduction, where "an effort is made to emphasize the fact that the constitutional histories of England and of the United States constitute a continuous and natural evolution which can only be fully mastered when viewed as one unbroken story," there are only four or five brief allusions to American history, and one of these is misleading. The author on page 342 alludes to the Agreement of the People, 1647, as the "prototype of all constitutions, State and Federal, as they exist to-day in the United States," a distinction probably due rather to the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut of 1639.

The volume is lacking also in that larger view of historical relations which is necessary for the full understanding and adequate presentation of English constitutional history, especially in its later development. In general, foreign relations are hardly noticed; no reference is made even to the American or to the French Revolution in their effect on the English constitution.

The author falls into the quite common error of attributing to Cranmer the idea of submitting the divorce question to the canonists and universities throughout Christendom, in order to influence the Pope or a General Council. Whether this was proposed by Cranmer in 1529, or by an assembly of bishops in 1527, is not as significant as the fact that Cranmer's advice was to get their opinions and then to act upon them by holding a court in England.

In following Froude too closely, also, Dr. Taylor is led into serious chronological and other errors. Thus he places the complaint of the commons against the clergy in the first session of Parliament in 1529, instead of in that of 1532. He also wrongly fixes the date of Anne Boleyn's marriage on the 25th of January, according to Lingard and Froude, instead of on the 14th of November, 1532, where probably it belongs, and he dates the origination of the divorce idea in 1527, when it really appears in 1526 or perhaps as early as 1525. The whole reform movement under Henry VIII. could be treated more clearly and adequately if some reference were made to foreign affairs and international relations, especially in the decade 1522 to 1532.

In the consideration of Elizabeth's reign nearly two-fifths of the chapter are devoted to ecclesiastical affairs, yet without bringing out their real constitutional importance and larger significance. Also in discussing the subject of poor relief and the important acts of Elizabeth's reign on this subject, the author falls into the common error of imputing to the dissolution of the monasteries, under Henry VIII., the great increase of the poor on account of the failure of this source of relief, a mistake made on pp. 97 and 98, and repeated on p. 188. As a matter of fact the first act of Henry VIII. on poor relief antedated the dissolution of the monasteries, at least of the larger ones, by two or three years, while the increase of the poor was due rather to the agrarian changes and the great agricultural distress and idleness. In reality, the almsgiving of the monasteries tended rather to foster the growth of a class of professional beggars, and as Fuller says: "the Abbeys did but maintain the poor which they made."

In this same chapter the author repeats the immoderate emphasis which, in the first volume, he laid on the *tungemot*, an institution having at best only a vague and mythical existence, an error which might have been corrected by a more careful study of Gneist and Maitland, and even Stubbs. There is much confusion between *tungemot*, manor, court leet, parish and tithing, which the author acknowledges on pp. 184 and 185, only to leave in a worse tangle of chronological and theoretical misstatements.

The personal element rarely appears in the work, a fact which makes the following sentence, p. 294, all the more unfortunate, showing an unhistorical prejudice hardly in accordance with fact. "In 1634 Prynne, a bigoted Puritan lawyer, had been punished by the Star Chamber for publishing a ponderous and stupid book called *Histriomastix*, in which he denounced with the virulence of that time all innocent human recreations in general and female actors in particular." As a matter of fact the work is directed mainly, if not altogether, against the stage and drama, the corruption of which in the seventeenth century is well known. It is full of learning and research, though undoubtedly it did appear stupid to Charles I. and his court. But the cruel severity of his punishments, which even an English churchman has characterized as "fearful sentences," ought to elicit some sympathy in the breast of an American of the nineteenth century.

The work is unduly drawn out by frequent repetitions, usually in almost the same words. In the consideration of Edward VI. we have nearly ten pages on Edward's accession and regency, six of which are practically a repetition of the precedents of succession and regency in preceding periods already fully described in earlier parts of the work and having little or no bearing on Edward's case. The reign of Mary, of little direct importance in the development of the constitution, receives eighteen pages, of which less than one is given to a consideration of the constitutional points involved in the Spanish marriage, while on the punishment of heretics the author refers to seven pages in the earlier part and repeats four pages of it. Indeed, as must have appeared already, there is much disproportionate treatment which, together with the repetitions, keeps out important matters. To give one more illustration. A very clear and full exposition of the law of libel is given, from the case of Wilkes down to the present time, but it occupies one-third of the whole space given to the long reign of George III., while at the close of the chapter on George III. and George IV. the author gives less space to the struggle between the crown and the ministry, and the reform of parliamentary representation.

There is too little organic connection between the various parts, most noticeably in the nineteenth century, where we seem to have a dictionary of detail rather than a philosophical presentation of modern conditions. Causes are almost completely ignored, and even the processes by which these conditions are reached are not worked out. No record appears of the agitation by the Radicals in the early part of this century, nor of the effect of economic distress. The various reform bills are noted, but, with the exception of that of 1832, no indication is given of the effect of each on the constitution. The great democratization of 1894 is not brought as the climax of a long development nor given the prominence which belongs to it; indeed a false or confused impression is given when on p. 583, treating of local government, a quotation from Rathbone, "a special student has lately expressed it," is given as true for 1897, when in reality Rathbone wrote in 1885 and the evils he criticised were considerably corrected by the later acts of 1888 and 1894.

Charles L. Wells.

Histoire Générale du IV^e Siècle à nous Jours. Ouvrage publié sous la direction de MM. E. Lavisse et A. Rambaud. Tome IX., Napoléon, 1800–1815. (Paris: Armand Colin et Cie. 1898. Pp. 1011.)

The ninth volume of this great encyclopedia is in all respects the peer of its predecessors. Our readers know of course that it is a collection of admirable monographs by specialists in the military, literary and diplomatic history of each and all the civilized and semi-civilized lands of the earth. Its unity consists in the epoch treated and in the stitching of the sheets into one great brochure. These monographs differ from each other in style and scientific value. For the most part they realize Droysen's ideal of a history which should be scientific as the natural sciences are and therefore caviare to the profane. The collaborators are twenty-one in number and among them are men like Aulard, Faguet, H. Houssaye, Moireau, Rambaud and Vandal, than whom there are no more distinguished historiographers in France; we use the word advisedly in its latter sense of official or semi-official historians, because with but a single exception they hold positions under the French government as instructors, curators or members of its academic organization. This fact is apparent in the treatment of all the various topics. Without exception the writers take the French and the republican standpoint; in some cases, as in that of Professor Aulard, the radical position; there is neither royalist nor imperialist polemic, no reactionary suggestion even, within the limits of the tome. There are twenty-seven lists of books, one for each of the sections, and in these there appears to be an absolute impartiality, every shade of opinion being represented. They are carefully revised, contain no trash and are invaluable to the student.

This instalment of the work, like the others, is, as we have said, essentially French in its general plan, being carefully calculated in outline, proportion and perspective for the rising generation of France. The Gallo-centric theory of history is ingrained in all its chapters. Yet it is not obtrusively set forth and for this epoch has more justification than for any other of modern history. The work of Napoleon was all-inclusive in its European contact and influence, the mainsprings of politics, diplomacy and war were for these fifteen years under his control, as far as the Continent is concerned, and in some respects general history turned on him as on a pivot. Yet we might well expect a more extended treatment of his most important adversary than is here given. About thirty-five pages in all are devoted to the specific treatment of British affairs, not many more than are set apart for the doings of the United States. The latter are discussed by Moireau, an authority on our history, the former by Sayous, who though excellent is neither a master nor a specialist.

As might be expected the rupture of the treaty of Amiens is attributed to its violation by Great Britain, but full justice is done to the fact that at best it was only a truce. As to the other great question of Napoleonic policy there is a similar specious impartiality. M. Vast declares that the second camp of Boulogne and all the naval preparations for the invasion of England were not a feint, but were the indications of a settled purpose. For this he adduces no proof, but on the other hand admits that the third coalition was already complete, that England had furnished the funds, that Russia and Austria were ready to crush France; he emphasizes the fact that Napoleon always studied his problems for two solutions, that the famous plan for invading Austria, which paralyzed the contemporary world by its genius and still stands as the classical example of a prodigy in strategic science, was the outcome of a long and minute study, and that, in the words of Ségur, its prevision foresaw the chief events as they actually occurred, their dates and decisive results, as clearly as if a month after the facts the great general and statesman had had to recall them as souvenirs. Surely facts have more value in history than speculations.

The person and character of Napoleon are nowhere in these pages brought into clear light. He moves vaguely and perhaps all the more impressively over nearly all. But the intention throughout is to give

France and the French full credit for what was great and enduring in his work, while the weaknesses and failures of her leader are exhibited as all his own. To one important question, the return from Elba, full justice is done. It is fairly stated that the Emperor of Austria had kidnapped Napoleon's son, that Metternich had delivered his wife into the hands of a court bully, that Castlereagh contemplated his deportation, that Talleyrand was conspiring to put him into an *oubliette* and that hired assassins were on his track; it is admitted that had the income solemnly promised by France been paid, his wife and child been returned to his home, and his life made secure, that had this simple justice been done, possibly Napoleon would have remained in his retreat. But here again the facts are stronger than the hypothesis. Napoleon was treated with indignity and bad faith, he was Napoleon and only forty-five years old. The consequences are well known and the narrative which sketches them in this volume is one of its excellent sections. Incidentally it is curious to note that Grouchy bears the chief blame for Waterloo, just as Desaix has been credited with the victory of Marengo. Soult, Ney and Napoleon's illness have a share in the disaster. Nowhere are the results of the latest research better used than in the brief but sufficient account of the emperor's downfall. There is no jeremiad, moreover, concerning the brutality of Sir Hudson Lowe, so long a favorite stalking-horse of French writers.

These scattered and sparse indications must suffice to explain the reviewer's opinion of this admirable work. It is a specimen of the best that modern France can do with its own history, and that best is very good indeed. But there is only a limited sense in which the history is general and the volume is more valuable to students than to readers; the American public, too, must receive it under the reserves due to the conditions already noted, that it is a semi-official manifesto of the Third Republic.

France. By JOHN EDWARD COURTENAY BODLEY. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1898. Two vols., pp. xviii, 346, vi, 504.)

DE TOCQUEVILLE'S *Ancien Régime*, Daudet's novels and the telegraphic reports of the daily newspapers have hitherto furnished the average cultivated American or Englishman with all his information about French political life. It is true that here and there in the United States one comes across a certain cult of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* such as is hardly ever to be found in England; and a steady reader of that respectable journal would doubtless learn a great deal in the course of time. But so leisurely and fragmentary a method of acquiring knowledge is hardly adequate for the purposes of the political student; and there has long been a real need for some substantial and more or less impartial treatise which should attempt to do for the one great "Republic" of the Old World what Mr. Bryce has done for that of the New.

And Mr. Bodley's two volumes are in many respects excellently well fitted to fill the gap. They are the work of a man who has known how to use his very unusual opportunities to make the acquaintance of some of the most distinguished Frenchmen of this and the preceding generation; who has lived in France for seven years in different places and under a wide range of varying conditions; who has assiduously studied the literature of the subject; a man of independent judgment, shrewd sense and an eye for character. He gives us, in fact, a great deal of information as to the actual working of French political institutions, both central and local, both administrative and parliamentary; and, what is much more, he arrives at one great generalization, reiterated again and again, approached from a hundred points of view and confirmed by every new line of thought on which he enters, which, whether we agree with it or not, is of a kind to challenge our consideration.

Mr. Bodley's contention is this, that the two great features of the present French political system, the centralized administration and the parliamentary government, are "fatally incompatible" (I. 33; II. 184). The centralized bureaucracy, the work of the great Napoleon for whose constructive genius Mr. Bodley can hardly find terms of praise sufficiently lofty, has been the salvation of France; is entirely suited to the genius of the French people; is acquiesced in by all, and ardently believed in by most intelligent Frenchmen; and there is not the slightest likelihood that it will ever be substantially changed. Those Radicals who made a reputation, under the Third Empire and since, by crying out for decentralization, make no real effort, when they get hold of the reins of government, to modify the system; and they use the power it gives them without a moment's scruple. On the other hand, the system of parliamentary government, by cabinets commanding, for the moment, a majority in the Chamber of Deputies, has been hopelessly discredited by the rancor it has occasioned, the corrupt practices it has stimulated, the inferior politicians it has nourished, and its almost comic instability. And while the administration is continually hampered by its subordination to ephemeral parliamentary chiefs, Parliament is still more demoralized by its administrative patronage. The only element of self-government, as Americans or English conceive of it, which the masses of the French people cling to is universal suffrage; but the only employment of it which they can understand is a plebiscitary one. It is in this direction alone, therefore, that we can look for a way out from the present difficulties; and Mr. Bodley, had he to enroll himself in any of the party classifications which he sets forth in his second volume, would doubtless place himself among "the plebiscitary element" (II. 385). He is not a Bonapartist, but he has Bonapartist views. But how little sanguine he is, we must let him tell us:

> "The only hope of an improved state of things lies in the prospect of the voice of the nation delegating its powers to an authoritative hand instead of to parliamentary representatives. But apart from the retrograde character of such a change, which would sadden doctrinaires, no leader capable of touching popular sympathies has shown the faintest sign of existence. When he arises he may be the *bon tyran* of M. Renan's optimist dreams; but on the other hand there is always the fear of

a shallow military adventurer being disastrously hailed to rescue the land from parliamentary anarchy. Moreover, the most definite prospect of ending the present state of things rests in the vague future which lies beyond the issues of the next European conflict; and war is so dreaded by the French . . . . that rather than contemplate its horrors they would submit to an infinitely worse régime than the present, to the defects of which the great mass of the population is absolutely indifferent" (I. 39).

That France suffers from grave political evils there is no denying, and Mr. Bodley makes us realize these evils very distinctly. It is evident, also, that the only safe foundation for generalizations in political science is the thorough study of specific examples. Yet one cannot but regret that Mr. Bodley has not allowed himself from time to time to look outside France at other democratic experiments, and also that he has not paid more attention to what, for want of a better term, we may call the general principles of government. He would have handled his theme more convincingly, and perhaps have more carefully guarded some of his assertions.

Thus: "Ephemeral ministries must succeed one another at brief intervals . . . . *because* France possesses a centralized system of administration" (II. 277); the argument being that the administrative system facilitates the advent of Cæsarism, and that this is so dreaded by parliamentarians that, as soon as any minister has been a few months in power, they begin to cabal against him. But are ministries in Australia particularly stable, where there is no thought of Cæsarism? Again Mr. Bodley points out that the result of the present combination of parliamentary government with bureaucracy is that "each member of Parliament, *not hostile to the government*" (the italics are my own) "becomes a wholesale dispenser of places, controlling the administrative and fiscal services of his constituency, and supervising the promotion of the judges" (I. 33). But this patronage one would expect either to help to keep ministries in office, as it did in England in the eighteenth century, or to assist in consolidating two great rival parties, as it notoriously does in the United States to-day. What needs to be explained is not only why the existence of the French bureaucracy has had certain effects, but also why it has not had others, which *a priori* are just as probable.

Or to take a smaller matter, but still one of great importance. "The causes of the Senate's lack of influence," says Mr. Bodley, "must be looked for within its own composition" (II. 50). Surely it is much truer to say, as Mr. Lowell does, in a book (*Governments and Parties in Continental Europe*) which certainly does not sink in our estimation on comparison with Mr. Bodley's, that "this must necessarily be the condition of one of two chambers whenever the cabinet is responsible to the other; and the cabinet cannot in the long run be responsible to both." The fact is that beneath French nature there is human nature, and beneath the workings of specifically French institutions there are the exigencies of all political life; and Mr. Bodley hardly attempts to distinguish between the two categories.

Mr. Bodley reminds us again and again that the great body of the people are quite contented with the government so far as it touches them, and trouble themselves but little with the faction fights of Paris. He would not perhaps have left upon us so gloomy an impression in the end, if he had given us some further account in detail of that administrative system to which he so often refers in general terms. We should like to know how the ranks of the service are recruited, what are its main branches and their duties, what is the normal career of a young civil servant of ability. We gather that the civil service of France is free from all suspicion of corruption in any of its grosser forms. We gather also that it is filled on the whole with competent men, who do their work with efficiency. If this is so, there is some excuse for the popular apathy about the proceedings of the Chamber; and Mr. Bodley, in concentrating his attention on the parliamentary system, may even be thought to have been paying unconscious homage to an idol of the British market-place. But even the Devil is not quite black; neither the United States nor England, blessed as they are with two great parties, could boast of that "continuity of foreign policy which has been one of the most remarkable phenomena . . . of the Third Republic" (II. 282). Moreover, he may conceivably "take a thought and mend." As against the dogmatic assertions of Mr. Bodley that "the idea of introducing the party system into the French Parliament is a chimerical dream of theorists" (II. 349), and that "there is no more prospect of it than there is of the resurrection of the Merovingian kings" (II. 323), I am inclined to set the observation of Mr. Lowell that, with the acceptance of the Republic by the Right, one at least of the great obstacles to the formation of two great parties is in course of removal (*o. c.*, 105).

Though we may not quite follow Mr. Bodley in his conclusions, his book is extraordinarily interesting. He has something significant to tell us of a score of aspects of French life which have hardly ever attracted the attention of English observers. Let me signalize the pages on the three virtuous bodies still left to France, the Army, the University and the Clergy (I. 53–56); on anticlericalism in the provinces (I. 147–156); on the use of titles in modern France and the mischievous results of governmental inconsistency (I. 179–191, II. 374–380); and on the failure of the school system to promote the sense of social equality (I. 201–203). As to the gulf which has opened between the world of fashion and the intellect of the nation (I. 194–200) we may add to what Mr. Bodley says that the same phenomenon was already observed in the early days of the Second Empire. M. Scherer, dining with Sir M. Grant Duff in 1863, as the latter's diary records, "spoke much of the divorce of intellect and position which is so strange a feature in French society at present." It is hardly worth while criticizing details; but some two or three points may be barely mentioned. Mr. Bodley has quite an exaggerated opinion of the merits of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences. That "the civilized world looks to the dome of the Institute for instruction in many a branch of legislative and economic science, in the principles of colonization and of jurisprudence" (II. 53), will be news to economists generally outside France; and if Mr. Bodley wishes to discover some of the reasons which have deprived his "authorities," including unfortunately even his friend M. Leroy-Beaulieu, of influence, he has but to read the article of M. Gide on French Political Economy a few years ago in the *Political Science Quarterly*. If he will look at Mr. Charles Booth's last volume, he will confess that his phrase about "the hopeless misery of the poor of our English cities" (I. 26) is a little conventional. And if he will look up the history of the Physiocrats he will observe that the bottom lines of Vol. II., page 235, require rewriting.

A word as to the style. There are whole pages in the book that are perfectly clear, and there are paragraphs here and there forcibly expressed. The summing-up of the effects of the French Revolution (I. 257–8) is a fine example, but it is too long for quotation. Mr. Bodley, moreover, has a turn for epigram. "Every Frenchman wishes to incite his neighbor to go to the colonies" (I. 54). "The strength of the . . . . . Franco-Russian alliance is the ignorance which the two nations have of one another" (I. 61). Things like this he can say prettily. In spite of all this the book is not easy reading. It is not so much that Mr. Bodley has become so French that he occasionally forgets his English; thus neither "inquest" (I. 2), nor "emphasism" (I. 17), nor "nobiliary" (I. 171), nor "incidents inspired" (I. 189), nor "dispensed him of the need" (II. 84), nor "law passed for his intention" (II. 90), belong to his mother tongue. Nor is it so much that the want of practice in writing reveals itself in many a lumbering and awkward sentence. It is chiefly because Mr. Bodley is so full of his subject, so mindful of all the historical coincidences or contrasts that the immediate subject suggests that he is seldom content to tell anything quite simply. He will thrust into the sentence one dependent clause after another, of comment or allusion, until even the interested reader becomes weary of the perpetual strain upon his attention. I feel bound to make these observations in view of the further volume which Mr. Bodley promises us, on the Church and on the Social Question in France, which are sure to be instructive, and, one would fain hope, easier reading.

W. J. Ashley.

The Historical Development of Modern Europe from the Congress of Vienna to the Present Time. By Charles M. Andrews, Associate Professor of History in Bryn Mawr College. Vol. II., 1850–1897. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1898. Pp. vii, 467.)

Under the wide-spreading shelter of this title Professor Andrews completes his review of the political development of France, Italy and the German states. The first volume of this work (noticed in the Review for January, 1897) contained an admirable description of the contention between the new wine of Liberalism and the old bottles of Absolutism into which that wine was poured in Central Europe between 1815 and 1850. That description closed with the self-destructive triumph of the remnants of the old régime in the period from 1848 to 1850. The present volume shows how indestructible were the forces of national sentiment liberated by the French Revolution and imperfectly restrained during the first half of this century. It shows how, since 1850, the ideals of the old régime crumbled into dust, the old bottles burst all asunder, and a new Europe arose dominated by the two European *colossi* of the century, Cavour and Bismarck. These two nation-makers, and that visionary Bonaparte whom each of the others employed as a tool, are the central figures upon the canvas, as painted by Professor Andrews.

The author evinces an excellent and improving power of felicitous generalization. His study of Napoleon in the first volume was a pattern of condensed yet clear narration, and in this volume there is a discriminating and satisfying dissection of Napoleon's nephew. Two chapters are devoted to his administration in France, a system founded upon a legend and wrecked by dishonesty. There is an interesting description of Louis Napoleon's enlightened theories of commerce and of his half-realized dreams of industrial progress; of his tentative, vague foreign policy, marvellously fortunate in the Crimean War and ever after hopelessly blundering; of his subserviency to advisers and favorites, from the shrewd rascals who helped him into power to the fools and bigots who pushed him into his last war; and finally of the dexterity with which Cavour and Bismarck in turn used him.

The third republic gets scant measure in one chapter. Italian history since the death of Cavour is even more hastily sketched. In less than twenty pages even the political history of the Russian mammoth during forty years can be little else than an epitome.

Half of the volume, however, is allotted to the political history of the states of Germany and of the Balkan peninsula during the same period. The chapters on the rise of Prussia and the unity of Germany present a concise and accurate exposition of Bismarck's aims and achievements, and, incidentally, a lucid explanation of the whole Schleswig-Holstein question, that crux of mid-century politics. The final chapter on the German Empire is devoted mainly to Bismarck, the *Culturkampf* and the social-democrats, although the author attempts a rapid survey of the deeds of William, the war-lord, bringing the narrative, as in other concluding chapters, down to the year 1897.

Two chapters are assigned to the tortuous course of Austrian politics since 1850, and to the triumphs of the Magyar. The inquisitive reader, who may demand consistency even in names, may wonder why Austria-Hungary is correctly called in the title of one chapter "The Dual Monarchy," and in the other "The Austro-Hungarian Empire."

It is unfortunate that the treatment of the Eastern Question could not be less inadequate and desultory. Even for a rapid review there are too many gaps in the story. The religious and racial issues involved in the

Eastern Question are, from the necessities of space probably, but lightly touched upon, while at the end of the chapter the author barely finds room to mention the "silent commercial war" which England has now for some years been sustaining against the jealous and hostile Continental powers, and which has hampered her action in Armenia and Crete.

Neither does he more than allude to the new "far-Eastern question," into which the old one is now merging, although there is no more attractive chapter in the historical development of Europe than the one which treats of the Europeanization of Asia and Africa.

No such chapter, however, could be written without a consideration of the greatest miracle of political force that this century has seen, viz.: the establishment of the English Empire in India, and without a consideration also of the effect of this marvellous expansion of English power upon the relations of England and Russia. But our author has resolutely excluded England, as a major subject, from his pages, a fact which, in view of his title, inevitably suggests the proverbial mutilation of Hamlet.

Throughout these two volumes Professor Andrews has in view the general reader rather than the specialist scholar. There is no parade of citations nor exploitation of original documents. The author's aim is to tell the story of Central European politics during this century simply, clearly and forcefully. This ambition is realized. He who runs may read. It is such a book for the English reader of history as Professor Ernest Lavisse writes for the French public. It is a succession of skilful summaries, first, of the duel between Liberalism and the age of Metternich; second, of the transformation of the map of Central Europe by the power of the sentiment of race-unity and by the genius of statesmen; third, of the most salient events in Central European politics since 1870.

Professor Andrews ignores all temptations to turn aside for the discussion of episodes and details, or, usually, even for the analysis of individual character. Preferring to reveal a statesman's quality by his work, he allows himself but little freedom in personal portraiture. Possibly the only exceptions are Cavour and Louis Napoleon, who are so well drawn that the author's self-denial in other instances may well cause regret. In passing, it may be worth while to question why the name of the French diplomatist, Benedetti, appears in every instance as "Bendetti," a form which is surely unsanctioned by usage.

Some will think that the author has been too sparing of the customary aids to historical study. He states in the preface that he has omitted a general bibliography of the works consulted, and then proceeds to fill a page and a half with the names of authors whose works he has used. Either a carefully arranged and comprehensive bibliography should have been inserted (which seems by all means to be preferable), or this heap of abbreviated references should have been omitted altogether. In this second volume there are two maps, although there is nothing in either table of contents or index to denote their presence. One shows Western Europe in the period 1866–1870, and the other illustrates the treaty of San Stefano. It would have been advantageous in a volume treating of so many territorial changes to increase the quantity of this kind of illustrative material. There is also a genealogical chart to explain the disputed succession in Denmark and Schleswig-Holstein. Upon the library shelves Professor Andrews's books should be suitable and valuable companions and supplements to A. L. Lowell's erudite discussion upon governments and parties in modern Europe and to Professor Burgess's philosophical treatise upon modern constitutions.

CHARLES H. LEVERMORE.

The Life of Napoleon III By ARCHIBALD FORBES. (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co. 1898. Pp. viii, 355.)

READERS of current magazine literature have doubtless during the last few years noticed frequent articles upon campaign and war subjects by Mr. Archibald Forbes, the well-known journalist and war-correspondent. This activity in times of peace has culminated in a more ambitious work than Mr. Forbes has hitherto attempted—a life of Napoleon III. In default of a preface from which to obtain a statement of the author's purpose in writing the book we are thrown back on the conclusion arrived at after perusal that it was written for the publishing trade with a view to dollars. There are unmistakable traces of "pot-boiling," notably in the first half of the book: long extracts from one to three pages in length, taken from the writings of Louis Blanc, Kinglake, Blanchard Jerrold, and others, show the ease with which copy can be produced; while the stress laid upon the incidents of boyhood and youth, and the space given to the Strassburg and Boulogne incidents and to the military aspects of the reign, show that Mr. Forbes has given special prominence to the dramatic side of his subject. Instances of padding appear more frequently in the first half of the work; later, when the author is dealing with the period of his own experiences, he depends less on others, and at times brings out interesting bits of first-hand information, as when he recounts the story told him in Zululand by the Prince Imperial of certain happenings in the Sedan campaign.

But for the purpose intended—the creation of a readable and popular biography—Mr. Forbes has not done his work badly. The style is clear and simple, rarely journalistic; the various scenes and situations are pleasantly and graphically presented; the intricacies of diplomacy, when touched upon, are made surprisingly easy, and hard problems are almost entirely eliminated: constitutional questions are passed over rapidly, while personal matters and biographical details are given places of prominence, so that with its thirty-seven illustrations the book may easily hold the attention of the reader for the three or four hours required for its perusal. And the publishers have done their work well: for in the presence of such a heavy book as McCarthy's *Life of Gladstone*,—a very good example of what a publisher should be ashamed of,—it is a pleasure to handle this light, attractive and typographically perfect production.

It may be a mooted point whether a writer of popular history ought or ought not to instruct as well as to entertain his readers; but certainly there can be no doubt that he ought to have regard for historical proportion and historical truth. In neither of these particulars has Mr. Forbes been strikingly successful: he has sacrificed political and diplomatic issues for those purely domestic and military; has devoted 121 pages to the period of Louis Napoleon's life before 1848, and but 27 pages to that from 1848 to 1852; and while allowing 23 pages to the Mexican campaign he disposes of the internal history of France from 1860 to 1866 in eight, an unfair allowance inasmuch as the Emperor, taking no part at all in the actual movements in Mexico, was involved at every point in the political struggles at home. Equally striking are the omissions. Mr. Forbes passes over in silence many notable events in the history of the Second Republic, without a knowledge of which no understanding of the *coup d'état* is possible—the uprising of June 13th, the Roman expedition, the letter to Ney, the elections of 1850. Failure to note these incidents has led Mr. Forbes to make the astounding statement, as unnecessary as it is untrue, that Louis Napoleon's first acts as president "were to suspend universal suffrage, now that it had served his turn; to shackle the press; to suppress associations of all kinds—in a word to crush the expression of public opinion" (pp. 128–129). In his discussion of the period after the Italian war he omits all mention of the expedition to China and the occupation of Syria, has no place for *Les Cinq* and the growth of the constitutional opposition, knows nothing of the war with the ecclesiastical party in France, and, strangest of all, omits all reference to the elections of 1863, which announced to Europe that Paris could no longer be counted on to support the Emperor.

But it is in connection with his discussion of foreign affairs and diplomacy that Mr. Forbes's most serious omissions are to be noted. In the first place he does not so much as mention the uprising of the Poles and Napoleon's effort to bring about an alliance of England, Austria and France in 1863; consequently he is forced to explain Napoleon's refusal to join England in upholding the treaty of 1852 as due to the latter's rejection of the congress proposal, an explanation both inadequate and misleading. He quotes with unnecessary display the proposals made by Rouher and Prince Napoleon in June and August, 1866, regarding an alliance with Prussia, but by omitting all reference to the popular feeling in France, the hostility of the *Corps Législatif*, the wire-pulling of the two parties—Austrian and Prussian—in the government at Paris, and more noteworthy still by saying nothing whatever of the famous Lavelette circular, he manages to leave an impression regarding Napoleon's share in these intrigues that is not true to fact. The Emperor's diplomacy was bad enough at best, but it does seem unfortunate that a reputable writer should so present his material as to make this diplomacy seem much worse than it was. It is difficult to believe that Mr. Forbes has ever read Sybel, much less Rothan's *La Politique Française en 1866*, for he presents a view of Napoleon that was popular twenty years ago and writes of Benedetti with all the animus of a correspondent of the *London Daily News* in 1870.

But especially does Mr. Forbes fall short in his account of the Hohenzollern candidature and the causes of the Franco-Prussian war, for so far as new evidence is concerned he might as well have written just after the war what he has written to-day. He shows no familiarity with Sorel's *Histoire Diplomatique de la Guerre Franco-Allemande* or with *Aus dem Leben Königs Karl von Rumänien,* the former of which suggests while the latter proves that Bismarck saw in the Spanish candidature a pretext for war, which he was determined to use at the first opportunity; and this is the more strange in that Sir Charles Dilke made all the facts known to English readers in the first number of *Cosmopolis* several years ago. Though Mr. Forbes quotes Lebrun's memoirs he does not see their importance as disclosing the chief reason why Bismarck wanted war in 1870; that is, to forestall any attempt of France to ally with Austria and Italy and to engage in war with Prussia in 1871.

These points are sufficient to indicate that while Mr. Forbes has written a readable life of Napoleon III. he has not presented an adequate or reliable study of the character of Napoleon's reign, the nature of his diplomacy, or the causes of his downfall.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

The Spanish Revolution, 1868–1875. By EDWARD HENRY STROBEL, late Secretary of the U. S. Legation and Chargé d'Affaires at Madrid. (Boston: Small, Maynard and Company. 1898. Pp. 293.)

THIS interesting little book is modestly described by the author as a sketch of an episode in modern Spanish history. In reality, it is a clear and comprehensive parliamentary history of the six turbulent years which began with the expulsion of Isabella II. and ended with the restoration of Alphonso XII. It deals therefore with the interregnum during which Prim was master, with the well-intentioned attempt of Amadeus, with the several experiments in the founding of a republic, and with the reaction that led through a dictatorship to the recall of the Bourbons.

The book has two principal defects. It fails to give any account either of the causes which influenced the kind of public opinion that prevails in Spain, or of the popular movements that determine in the long run the fate of all political schemes. And it plunges into the middle of events without adequate explanation of existing conditions. It assumes, in both particulars, the same knowledge in the reader as in the author concerning the antecedent history of Spain, and the habits, tastes, temper and political traditions of the Spanish people. These defects are however inherent in the author's plan of publishing separately, and as a detached account of one historical episode, matter which was originally written as part of a larger work.

On the other hand, the book has many merits. Its literary qualities are conspicuous. It is written in a strong and lucid style, which is never dull and becomes at times delightfully epigrammatic. The narrative is compact and continuous, and almost epic in its development. And although there is no direct attempt at portrait-painting, there are some singularly acute estimates of the more conspicuous personages.

The most commanding figure is of course Prim,—the masterful leader of his time, "a Cromwell without convictions," the one man in all Spain who knew when to keep silent, the one man who might have changed the course of events. Next to Prim, the chief actor is Castelar. His honesty of purpose and his readiness to own himself wrong when he saw where his theories were leading, are fully recognized; and some capital translations of portions of his speeches serve as examples of his prodigiously effective oratory. Of Serrano, there is a striking picture. He is depicted during the last year before the Restoration, face to face with the problems of the Carlist war, and vacillating perpetually,—now warmed by the hope of popularity through a military success, now chilled by the dread that if the war were ended, the army, unemployed, would pronounce for Alphonso.

But the chief value of the book lies in its accounts of the procedure of the Cortes, the mode of forming committees, and the generous opportunities afforded for unlimited and unfailing oratory; and in its clear presentation of Spanish methods in the working of representative government. Not that the author's aim is didactic; but he deals with a period of constant change in which national idiosyncracies found frequent occasions for display, and he has effectively grouped the facts so as to throw a vivid light on the peculiar difficulties that lie in the way of a government of the people and by the people of Spain.

Of these difficulties, the most subtle and persistent is the inability of Spanish politicians to unite in steadfast parties for the purpose of accomplishing well defined and openly avowed objects. In greater or less degree this curious failure to attain the true essential of all parliamentary government is common to non-English-speaking races, although in Spain the lack of coherence and party discipline is perhaps most apparent. During the period from 1868 to 1875, when events were marching swiftly, the shifting of parliamentary groups was incessant. The two dynastic parties —the Carlists and the Alphonsists—having deep roots in the past, were more or less permanent. The other groups, usually four or five in number, had none of the characteristics of healthy growth. They were thrown together with the suddenness and definiteness of the patterns in a kaleidoscope, and the component particles were scattered and rearranged in the same instantaneous and surprising way. Such a scene as that of the famous debate of St. Joseph's night—of which Mr. Hay has given a stirring picture in his *Castilian Days*—when Topete dramatically left the government of Prim in the face of the whole shouting Cortes—is characteristic. Even more picturesque were the events which terminated the presidency of Figueras. Early on a Saturday morning he received a vote of confidence and thanks and was declared to have deserved well of the country; in the afternoon of the same day there was a crisis over a financial measure; and on Wednesday the President had fled to France.

Spanish politicians have also signally failed to comprehend that the whole structure of representative government necessarily rests on the belief of the people that they are in fact represented. In other words, no form of popular government can long endure unless the dominant part of the community is, on the whole, satisfied with the method of conducting the elections. That such is not the case in Spain, and that the popular distrust in this regard is one of the permanent causes of the instability of its governments, abundantly appears from the work under review. At the first election after the expulsion of Isabella, in January 1869, there was indeed an effort to secure a genuine expression of the public will; but thereafter the temptation to manufacture good majorities in the Cortes became too strong to be resisted. The well-tried method of putting up official candidates backed by unconcealed intimidation, was again applied at every election. "In a genuine parliamentary government," says our author, "it is the function of the people to decide who is to be the government; in Spain, the converse of this is true, and the government decides what is to be the result of the elections." As the result of this inability of minorities to secure just representation, we find as an established weapon of party warfare the *retraimiento*, or withdrawal of a group from the Cortes and abstention of its voters from the polls—which action almost invariably means conspiracy, followed by an appeal to arms.

Another notorious feature of Spanish politics, of which there are no less than three examples in the short period covered by this book, is the part played in every successful revolution by the military forces. The revolt of the fleet under Topete in September, 1868, the *coup d'état* of Pavia in January, 1874, and the final mutiny under Jovellar and Martinez Campos, were the events that really marked the progress of the Revolution. The incident of the abdication of Amadeus was also ultimately brought about by the refusal of the artillery officers to serve under an unpopular general. Pavia was thought to be not quite sane because he did not proclaim himself dictator after his successful *coup d'état*. Of another general, Professor Strobel says that "he has to-day in Spain one distinction almost impossible to find among officers of equal rank and prominence. During a long and brilliant career he has never taken part in any *pronunciamiento* or military insurrection of any kind."

The causes of these peculiarities in the politics of the Spanish nation are no doubt infinitely complex, but it is to be regretted that Professor Strobel, while relating the events above referred to, has made no attempt to throw light on phenomena so singular and so full of warning. His book is, and professes to be, only a fragment. At the same time, it is so good that it is to be hoped the author will be encouraged to carry out his original purpose and give us the larger work which he has had in mind. An authoritative history of Spain in the English language, beginning with the accession of Charles IV.—almost at the moment of the outbreak of the French Revolution, when the extent of the Spanish colonial empire was at its maximum—and tracing the course of events down to the present day, would be of the greatest interest. And as the growth of the United States has been so intimately connected with the decay of the Spanish empire, such a work would be of peculiar value to American students.

It only remains to be said that the present book is handsomely printed, that it contains some annoying instances of careless proof-reading, that it has an inadequate map of Spain, and—worst of all—that it is unprovided with an index.

G. L. Rives.

Industrial Experiments in the British Colonies of North America. By Eleanor Louisa Lord. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Extra Volume XVII.] (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1898. Pp. viii, 154.)

This volume contains a somewhat detailed study of one phase of the British commercial system in the eighteenth century, viz., the policy which that government followed for the purpose of procuring from the colonies a supply of naval stores. Attention is mainly directed to the New England colonies, as they were the chief source of supply of that kind. Occasional reference, however, is made to the production of stores in the Carolinas and Pennsylvania, while an account is given of the experiment with the Palatines in New York. The concluding chapter deals summarily with a cognate subject, the rise of manufactures in the plantations. In appendices two price-lists of naval stores, principally tar, pitch, hemp and masts, are given.

In the first part of her dissertation Miss Lord traces the growth of interest among British merchants and officials in the plantations considered as a source of naval supplies. Should she ever make her treatment of this subject more exhaustive, she will find that the writings of Capt. John Smith, those of Strachey, and the manifestoes and relations which proceeded from the London Company contain not a few passages which show that they were alive to the prospective wealth of the colonies in naval stores. Perhaps the earliest references to the resources of New England in this direction are in Smith's *Description of New England* and his *New England's Trials*. Puritanism obscured this feature of colonization in New England and tobacco had a similar effect in Virginia. But as we approach the close of the seventeenth century it comes again into prominence and holds a leading place during the century which follows. Miss Lord's account of the persistent efforts of Sir Matthew Dudley and his associates to procure from the crown a charter incorporating them as a company for the production of naval stores is interesting and important. In that chapter she has fully and satisfactorily explained an episode respecting which a brief reference in a note of Palfrey contained about all the information that was previously accessible. Of the experiments with contract emigrant labor, that with the Palatines in New York had already been pretty fully investigated, and the most important documents respecting it have long been accessible;

but Miss Lord has been able to give a fuller account than any earlier writer of a similar effort to produce naval stores made about 1730 by David Dunbar and others in southern Maine east of the Kennebec River.

In the history of the system, however, the questions of chartered companies and of emigrant labor are of much less importance than the policy of encouragement by bounties and the efforts to preserve the woods, or trees within the woods, which were of size proper to be reserved for the royal navy. The second part of the volume is devoted to this subject. The origin and results of the act of Parliament of 1705, by which the bounty system was inaugurated, are explained. Under this act John Bridger was appointed surveyor-general of the woods. One of the most valuable features of this book is the account which the writer has been able to give of this office, of those who held it and their work, and of the commission of 1697 out of which it grew. Upon this subject only very fragmentary information has hitherto been available, though it constitutes one of the most interesting and suggestive chapters in the history of British colonial administration. In Miss Lord's narrative one can see the elements of difficulty which were of necessity involved in the problem of maintaining imperial control over the plantations—the indifference or opposition of the colonists; the faults of the administrative officers; the frequent failure of the home government to adequately support their efforts; the obstacles arising from distance, lack of means of communication, and the economic weakness and social disorder which are a necessary accompaniment of frontier life. Miss Lord has taken the system as it was and, so far as her subject demanded, has sought to show how it worked. This is the only scientific course, the only method which will lead to positive results. Her conclusions are that the application of the bounty system to tar and the allied products was fairly successful; that its application to hemp was a failure; that its application to masts and timber, combined as it was with the reservation of mast trees, led to a long and irritating struggle with the colonists which largely defeated the object of the act and contributed to their alienation from the mother country.

For the material of this monograph the author has gone to the original documents in the British Public Record Office. Her references are almost exclusively to these, and she has apparently examined everything bearing on the subject which is to be found in the New England Papers. This is the only proper course to follow, and through it alone will it ever be possible to learn what the nature of the old British colonial system was and how it worked. Other American students should follow her example, selecting special topics, the treatment of which they can make approximately exhaustive.

Among the papers relating to the administrations of Bellomont and Hunter in the *New York Colonial Documents* there is much correspondence relating to Bridger's career in the colonies and to the Palatines. Miss Lord would have conferred a favor on American students who may never be able to visit the Record Office, if she had introduced somewhat detailed references to these. If by references to *Calendar of State Papers*, Vol. 119 (pp. 2, 3 and 4) a manuscript copy of the *Calendar* is meant, it would have been better to have referred to the printed volume relating to America and the West Indies, 1675–1676, with Addenda, in which these entries appear. According to the printed *Calendar* the letter of Emanuel Downing, to which reference is made on p. 2, was written December 12, 1633, and the arrival of the first ship with masts from New England was reported by him, not two years thereafter, but on the 23d of the following August. It would seem that either the expression "two hundred miles," on p. 11, is a misprint, or that an exclamation point should have been placed after it. It does not seem to me that, as stated, the opinion of the solicitor-general, referred to on p. 111, lacks clearness, for he properly distinguishes between the right of towns to trees which stood on land granted to them prior to 1691 and their right to them when on land bestowed after the charter of that year with its restrictive clause had been issued.

HERBERT L. OSGOOD.

John Adams, the Statesman of the American Revolution, with other Essays and Addresses, Historical and Literary. By MELLEN CHAMBERLAIN, LL.D. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1898. Pp. vi, 476.)

PROFESSOR SEELEY, in 1871, by his *Roman Imperialism and other Lectures and Essays*, set a new fashion for men who have been in the habit of writing an occasional article or giving an occasional address. It has been not one of the least of his services to the literary world. It has led many a man, who would otherwise have left nothing with any character of permanence behind him, to group together in a single volume, without much regard to their coherence, ten or twelve detached contributions of real value to the cause of letters, which he may have made in a course of years, and which would otherwise be hopelessly buried in the transactions of learned societies, or the unsorted heaps of unbound magazines that crowd our library cupboards. Judge Chamberlain has done this, and if his paper written for the *Dartmouth College Monthly*, on "Landscape in Life and in Poetry," has no particular relation to "John Adams," it comes quite as close to him as in Seeley's volume the essay on "English in Schools" did to "Roman Imperialism."

Perhaps the most noteworthy part of the book under review lies in the positions which it advances as to the real key to American institutions. Judge Chamberlain does not look in dark chambers or medieval castles for it. American history is dealt with from the American standpoint. It is treated as a thing complete in itself, and having its real beginnings no farther back than the foundation of the first colonies. The author quotes Goldwin Smith's saying that the American Revolution was a misfortune to Americans because it cut them off from their history, but he does not accept it. Their history (p. 147) is to him their own history; and that of England before, let us say, the Elizabethan age throws little more light upon it than that of France or of Rome. The only story to be told is one as to the development of thirteen states out of thirteen land companies (p. 150).

These views attracted the attention which their freshness so boldly challenged when the author first presented them to the American Historical Association at its Boston meeting in 1887. He advanced them as theses to be considered, rather than as results which he was absolutely committed to defend. The course of historical study in the years that have since passed cannot be said to have weakened their force. There has been no lack of minute investigation of obscure events and rude records of long past ages, but it has achieved little more than to make darkness visible. It is, as he says (p. 169), good work to which to put the graduate student in our universities, for it is the kind of research of which he is best capable. But after it has earned him his doctor's degree, its place is generally in the waste-basket. The deep and controlling influences that have shaped American life belong to modern times, and the important documents to be examined, before the first Virginia charter, are few and not difficult to comprehend from their own terms.

Judge Chamberlain brought from the bench a spirit of candid and impartial examination into the causes of things which gives weight to his opinions, and they are expressed in a style as clear as it is forcible. His strong native powers were quickened for just such work by the wide acquaintance with general literature which gave him his place at the head of the Boston Library, and there gained new breadth and solidity.

The head of a great library has one special qualification for good literary work. He comes in daily contact with many minds, of the living and the dead. A stream of books is passing before his eyes in a constant and ever-varying succession, at each of which he takes a rapid glance. A competent librarian must have the faculty of quick perception. If he can add to it, as Judge Chamberlain could, that of easy assimilation, the best thoughts and most epigrammatic sentences of one author after another marshal themselves almost insensibly in line with whatever train of thought he may himself be working out, and become part of his intellectual capital. These essays are not overloaded with quotations, but they are full of apt references to wise words of other men, woven in at the right point and in a natural and graceful way.

The references to authorities in the notes are also important, and direct attention to some of the latest publications. The letter, for instance, first published by Boutell in 1896, of Roger Sherman, written to William Samuel Johnson in 1768, and objecting strenuously to the appointment of an American bishop, is cited (p. 21) in the essay on "John Adams, the Statesman of the Revolution," as a new support to the proposition that ecclesiasticism was its cause. In the picture of Adams there is brought into the foreground that quality of imagination and prophetic forecast which lends a glow to so much that came from his ready pen. The author justly paints him (p. 72) as stirred from his youth with the "sublime intuition of nationality," and calls attention to the fact that the Massachusetts Constitution, in drafting which he had so great a share, was the real prototype of that of the United States, and of those now in force in thirty-eight of our states (p. 87).

The essay on the "Authentication of the Declaration of Independence" is one of the first importance, and must be taken as the final word on the question whether any of the signers of the Declaration of Independence signed it on the Fourth of July.

If there is a single thought which stands out particularly in this volume as a challenge to criticism it is that the American became early differentiated from the Englishman by his associative spirit (p. 285). "To the typical Englishman the unit of force was the individual man: to the typical American, it was an organization." Did not our colonial charters plant the associative spirit here? Had we ever a local organization both as minute and as all-pervading as the Saxon tithings and hundreds? Was not the "General Association for King William," in 1696, with the millions of signatures upon its rolls, a genuine product of English character, and was it by his American travels that Cobden learned the need and the good of an "Anti-Corn Law League?"

SIMEON E. BALDWIN.

The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King, comprising his Letters, Private and Official, his Public Documents and his Speeches. Edited by his grandson, CHARLES R. KING. Volume V., 1807–1816. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1898. Pp. xv, 563.)

THE tone of this volume is not less pessimistic than the earlier ones, and to judge from King's correspondents, the condition of the country, which in 1801 they declared desperate, continued to degenerate, until it had passed beyond description, and the strongest adjectives and superlatives ceased to yield any satisfaction to the letter-writers. "In 1807," so one asserts, "neither learning, morals nor wisdom seem any longer to be regarded as subjects of popular esteem and favour," the people blindly showing "wilful, stupid confidence" in the President, lulled in "a sleep which really appears like the sleep of death." The letter-writers make very clear the causes and progress of the final breaking-down of the Federalist party. First and foremost it had become strongly unnational. "Our degraded country" is Gore's characterization; "We are not more virtuous than other states," King asserts, and he asks "Are Republics an inferior and debased species of government?" "The importance of America in the scales of Nations has been very much overrated—and when our national vanity is a little lowered, we shall certainly be a more estimable people," is John Trumbull's view, and he adds that America "must expiate her guilt by suffering;" "What is meant when we are told we must be Americans and support our government?" demands Troup. Yet when it came to intrigue and "dealing," the Federalists for the most part do not seem to have been above the very conduct which they blame so savagely in democracy. Over and over again, the democratic lust of office is dwelt upon, yet, in the Federalist bargain in 1807 concerning Governor Lewis, Troup advises that "we should be reasonable and moderate in our expectation of offices," though he adds with disgust "that some Federalists have been begging, intriguing, and working with all sorts of tools—for office"! while Gore records of Massachusetts that one reason for the waning of Federalism is that "many of the middle-aged and ardent politicians of our Section of Country have become tired of waiting for place and distinction. They sigh to represent the United States at some foreign court, or to enjoy Power and Influence at home"—a hankering which is all the more distressing and discouraging to the leaders because of the growing conviction they express that the Federalists will never again hold or distribute offices. King himself is forced to wonder "to what good purpose do a few impartial and worthy men toil and weary themselves in the public service?" and why they do not "retire from scenes which they cannot improve, and where they behold more clearly the degradation and the shameless corruption of their Country." Gouverneur Morris, the most discouraged of all this band of out-of-office patriots, asks the "serious question, what chance is there of better rulers if the Union be preserved?"

Such views, of course, entailed much discussion of the remedy; and there are many allusions to the breaking-up of the Union. Gore reports that men in Massachusetts were discussing "a declaration next winter that the Union is dissolved." Gouverneur Morris doubts "if it be possible to preserve the Union," and asks, "Must we wait till the Claws of a human Tiger rake our stinking Bowels to look for a Heart?" But it is to be noted that when it came to more definite action, Cabot asserts that he and others attended the Hartford Convention because "a measure of the Sort was necessary to allay the ferment and prevent a crisis," and his unalterable conviction was "that the worst of evils would be a dissolution of the Union, and all the good which could arise from the Convention would be, in case of the total failure of the powers of the Federal Gov't that a sort of organized body would be in existence, which might attempt to provide for the exigencies of the moment, and that all their endeavors were to avoid doing anything." Failing separation, "a reform of the Constitution is proposed," though King, in suggesting it, acknowledges that "I know our political adversaries will say that we aim at a monarchy; perhaps some of our friends even may suspect our views," and one cannot but wonder how the Federalists could hope of attaining a revision, when they could not gain simple majorities in more than a half-dozen of the states, and when, as they themselves noted, every new state admitted to the Union made the Federal cause the more desperate. In this connection it is particularly interesting to note a conversation between the Secretary of War, Armstrong, and King, in 1814, in which the former practically asserts that the government was not in earnest in endeavoring to recruit an army for the conquest of Canada, because "new views are entertained—pains are taken to impress upon the Western States that

Canada is a fertile and desirable country—if acquired by the U. S. that the surplus population of the east will go to Canada, and not as now, to the Western States—that the consequence would be to check their population and prosperity. This will endure till Canada be filled, hence it will be expedient to defer the conquest of Canada until the Western States are fully populated and their vacant lands taken up and settled;" that, in brief, Armstrong's opinion was that "the Virginia Dynasty will never allow to you an opportunity to take Canada."

There are many side and local issues touched upon, and as a whole the documents are of a peculiarly interesting and valuable nature. It is to be noted that as the work advances, the editorial part is slighted and somewhat heedless. Long series of documents are printed without a single comment, and wide breaks are passed over without any word as to what was occurring. Minor details, too, display carelessness. A note on page 492 should have explained that the "Count Survilliers" was Joseph Bonaparte. There are a good many typographical slips also, as "War" for Tar (p. 66), 1787 for 1797 (p. 107), "Coon" for Corn Market (p. 145), "possess" for profess (p. 366), and "four or five hundred dollars" for four or five hundred thousand dollars (p. 410).

PAUL LEICESTER FORD.

Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War. By Lieut.-Col. G. F. R. HENDERSON, Major in the York and Lancaster Regiment, Professor of Military Art and History in the Staff College. (London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1898. Two vols., pp. xiv, 550, 641.)

STONEWALL JACKSON was a normal human being, not a mythological creation. He was a soldier of great ability, activity and daring and not an irresponsible, erratic genius. In manner he was deferential, modest and retiring; in the presence of women diffident to excess; he never blustered and even on the field of battle was rarely severe except to incompetency and neglect. He judged himself more harshly than any one else did, but toward the weakness of others he had abundant charity. In religion, he was a quiet Christian gentleman, absolutely liberal and nonsectarian; he was too catholic to be a bigot and had none of "the presumptuous fanaticism of Cromwell." Like many another great soldier—Wolfe and Sherman for instance—he was at first thought to be "crazy," but his foes soon found out that he was always sober and in his right mind. Marvellous and eccentric as many of his movements were they were prompted, as Napoleon said of his own, "not by genius but by thought and meditation." He made war like a warrior of great brain and moral force, not as Blind Tom makes music, guided by whisperings no one hears but himself.

Until now General Jackson has not been fortunate in his biographers. Cooke's book was interesting in its day, but when it was written the author had little or no access to reports and necessary data. Written in a hurry, it rather reminds one of those hasty biographies of presidential candidates given to the public in the heat of their campaigns. Dr. Dabney's book has never been a favorite with those who were around and about Jackson in the dust and blood of his campaigns. He came to General Jackson with more training for the pulpit than for the field of battle. In his three months' service on the staff and in the army, he had no such knowledge of Jackson as the beloved and heroic Pendleton, whose untimely death deprived the army of Northern Virginia of the most brilliant staff officer in it and the South of the one man who could have written the life of his chief. Mrs. Jackson's *Life and Letters* is charming—a sweet portrait of their domestic life—the more gratifying that in her book, her good taste and good judgment carried her safely through temptations to talk and tell which have wrecked so many similar memorial reminiscences. But in Col. Henderson's book we have, at last, an elaborate and exhaustive military history and biography of Stonewall Jackson. Our hero is passed in review before a trained, scholarly and prominent English officer, who evidently has no bias in favor of the cause for which Jackson died. The reviewing officer proves to be as impartial as he is intelligent, unless it may be said that at times he is carried away by unrestrained admiration to the verge of excessive enthusiasm.

I took up the book with curiosity and anxiety, I read it with interest increasing with the chapters and I finished it with one regret—that the thousand pages were so few. I could make but one comment—"of Stonewall Jackson's military life the last word has been said."

A review of this comprehensive biography in the compass of a few thousand words is impossible.

The first thing that strikes the reader is the author's analysis of Jackson's personal character and mental equipment as bearing upon his military successes; it is most accurate and satisfactory. He seems to have made a study of the man as well as the soldier. He has truthfully fitted together the apparently disconnected parts of his make-up and has in so doing exhibited an understanding of the complex nature of the individual, such as no American biographer has attained. These portions of his book are worth careful reading by the casuist.

There is nothing in Jackson's campaigns which seems to appeal to Col. Henderson's admiration so much as the strategy of them. The author's training and large acquaintance with military history made Jackson in this regard an interesting study. Jackson was in the Mexican War as a very young man and one cannot doubt that the lesson he learned by the flank movements of the American army at Cerro Gordo and Contreras ripened into the wisdom which executed the flank movements at Second Manassas and Chancellorsville. And it should be noted in this connection that the Capt. R. E. Lee who pointed out and led the way to the two movements in Mexico, developed into the General Lee who approved and directed Jackson's two famous movements. Gen. Grant said "I never manoeuvre." Many other very great generals have done it and Grant himself when occasion required did it and, as our author intimates, did it well. But Grant had always so many troops to handle that he had rather "hammer away" than manoeuvre. Jackson would have resorted to strategy if he had commanded a million men; he couldn't help it.

Col. Henderson does not fail to note that, from the beginning, Jackson took an independent view of things and was not led away by huzzas. He knew that Bull Run was not a victory for the Confederates to be very wild about (for they were outmarched and outgeneralled in the first half of the day) nor such a disgraceful rout on the part of the Federal troops, as their own papers represented it to be. It is rightfully called "a Pyrrhic Victory." One thing is certain, Jackson never was satisfied with results at Bull Run. On the other hand, he said more than once that a defeat there had been better for us, eventually.

Just at this time, fresh from the Spanish War, where newspaper correspondents possessed the earth and tried to control government and armies, it is inconceivable how Jackson could have carried on his campaigns without them; but he did. He said "My brigade is not a brigade of newspaper correspondents." Several generals talked gently on that vein in Cuba and they suffered for it. From a private at Bull Run to the command of a brigade at Appomattox, in the field and on his staff, I never saw but one reporter in Jackson's command, and he lasted about twenty-four hours. This was the secret of his secrecy and of the thunderbolt swiftness of his surprises. Col. Henderson quotes Jackson's speech to his brigade at Manassas, the only speech he ever made. Did not a newspaper man report that? There was not one present. I, then a junior lieutenant of the Second Virginia Regiment, and T. Harris Towner, the orderly sergeant, wrote that speech out from memory within fifteen minutes after its delivery, comparing every word until we thought it absolutely correct. I sent it to the Richmond *Dispatch* with a few comments. It is the only report of that speech ever made and appears in this *Life*, with little change even in the comments, and has appeared time and again.

It is not permitted to follow Jackson's Valley Campaign as pointed out by Col. Henderson with the sword of a soldier and described with the pen of a scholar. It is an art-study in war. I can only skip over it. Like many others I am not able to understand General Jackson's treatment of Garnett because of Kernstown, and cannot agree with Col. Henderson. I was in that fight, in that brigade, a lieutenant commanding the color company of the Second Virginia. I saw seven color-bearers go down in succession and I never believed we could have held that line. A braver man than Garnett never lived. I saw him in Richmond, with streaming eyes, bending over the dead body of our great chief, when it lay in state there. A year later, leading his brigade at Gettysburg in Pickett's famous charge, he fell and died almost within reach of the enemy. I am convinced that in his treatment of Garnett, Jackson erred, as our author admits he was apt to do with those next in rank to him. His relations with Winder, who succeeded Garnett, were not any more pleasant, and Winder was one of the most brilliant officers in the army.

In this connection it may be remarked that Gen. Jackson's relations with his staff were peculiar. He lived with them on intimate terms, was generally cordial and considerate of them and they were devoted to him. He would not have kept any one of them who did not have his entire confidence. Yet with them he was absolutely reticent except when the occasion made it imperative to give them his confidence and then he had no hesitation in doing so. As he did not spare himself, he worked them harder than any general in the army; at times he seemed to think there was no limit to their endurance. Then, too, he evidently thought that the sense of duty faithfully performed was their sufficient reward, for unlike Stuart and Longstreet he took no special interest in their advancement or promotion. This was not because of indifference to them, but as he never sought promotion and only took that which came to him, it never occurred to him that they might be more like the average soldier. In fact his staff was always too small; as a corps commander he scarcely exceeded the allowance of a general of brigade. This made it necessary for all of them to do double duty and at times it unquestionably embarrassed him, as it did in the battles around Richmond and at Second Manassas. If one or two were ill or off duty, as at Second Manassas, the work the others were forced to do was almost beyond their powers; but they never complained. Hunter McGuire was equally willing to serve as aide-de-camp in a fight or as medical director, and Sandy Pendleton, the real adjutant-general, was anything from chief of staff to courier.

There are so many things in the description of the Valley Campaign that one would like to stop and comment on; but the editor of this REVIEW is inexorable. For instance I would like to say why I do not believe the author's explanation of Jackson's risky and terrible march from Conrad's Store to Port Republic is satisfactory; he could have gone by a good road over the mountain to Gordonsville and reached Staunton just as soon and as secretly. I would like to tell Col. Henderson that in following Gen. Taylor he is inaccurate in describing the appearance of Belle Boyd at Front Royal and the information she gave. It was I who called Gen. Jackson's attention to the flight of a woman from town, and he at Gen. Ewell's suggestion sent me to intercept her. I had known Belle Boyd from our childhood and was not much astonished to find her there. She gave me the message for the General clearly and rapidly, and turning back ran off to town, without speaking to any one else. I saw her again in town that day conversing with some Union officers—prisoners. Col. Henderson will find an account of this in her book, although not a very accurate one. I would like also to supplement the author's report of Jackson's night march in Winchester, which he has made so graphic, and to correct some little errors into which he has fallen in regard to Jackson's personal escape at Port Republic on that bright Sunday morning. For instance, the General was not mounted when the surprise came. He was loafing with his staff, watching their horses grazing loose on the field, and religious service had been ordered in camp. My horse was saddled to go to the blacksmith's, and as soon as the General was on his, I followed him in John Gilpin style. I think I was the last horseman to cross the bridge. Crutchfield and Willis, who had lingered too long abed, were captured in their efforts to follow ; Crutchfield escaped in a few minutes, Willis not until the next day. The rest of the staff were scattered. I was with the General when the by-play between him and the enemy's gun took place at the bridge, as related by Col. Poague, and was amused at it. But there was a discharge of Carroll's gun, before the General would believe. He then sent me for a regiment of infantry. I met Fulkerson's Thirty-seventh Virginia coming, and hurried him on to the attack and the bridge was retaken. Then followed the attack of Frémont and the battle of Cross-Keys. Jackson wanted to "keep Sunday," but couldn't. And then the next day was the battle of Port Republic, when Jackson closed the campaign with a clap of thunder and proved that after all, in war, Providence is more apt to side with big brains than big battalions.

Jackson has been charged by military critics with violating all the rules of war by his reckless movements in this campaign and afterwards at Second Manassas; no doubt it is true. The same charge was made against Napoleon by Wurmser in the Mantuan campaign. Rules of war are very well, but there are times when a great general sees that they must be disregarded. Jackson knew them all and he knew when to violate them. He never failed when he did; let that be his apology.

Passing over the rest of this delightful volume, we may take up the second volume and stop to see what the author has to say of Jackson's alleged failure to co-operate on the 26th of June, just after he joined Lee at Richmond. Col. Henderson goes into this matter fully and finds full reason for Jackson's course. It may be added that General Jackson ought not to have been assigned to the extremely hazardous and delicate military duty set before him. He had just arrived from the Valley and did not know the country over which he was to operate, and a most difficult country it was. His army had been marching and fighting since early spring—was worn out—and he was not given time to take his bearings and learn a topography so altogether different from that of the Valley. And here again, his staff was not large enough to do the work he was compelled to require of them. Certainly no one with him on that occasion can recall that he let down for one moment from his unceasing "push-on;" and if he did not accomplish the impossible, another thing is certain, it abated nothing of General Lee's admiration for him.

Skipping along in the book I would like to stop Col. Henderson and ask if he has not been too liberal in answering the criticism against the General for rushing into the battle of Cedar Mountain, without a more complete formation. It has been said that he opened that fight with the first file of fours marching in column. It seemed to his staff very much that way. He won as usual and that answers criticism generally, but perhaps he might have won with less loss. It would have gone badly with the other man if he had tried that game on Jackson.

We dare not stop even to glance at the brilliant, record-breaking campaign against Pope, and can only touch upon a few light things about Sharpsburg. Each was a campaign in itself, and how admirably Col. Henderson has fought them. I am glad the author calls the one Sharpsburg and not Antietam. Antietam was a military misnomer; and Mr. John C. Ropes was the first northern writer to find it out.

If Napier thought it was "a very audacious resolution" for Wellington at Fuentes de Onor, with 32,000, to wait and receive the attack of Marmont with 40,000, what would he have thought of Lee at Sharpsburg with 35,000 scattered infantry offering to fight McClellan with more than twice that number?

Just here, there is a question claiming the attention of the present-day historian of Sharpsburg; did General Jackson concur with General Lee in making the fight on the north side of the Potomac? Col. Henderson takes it for granted that he did. I think there can be no doubt of that. I recollect that just as Harper's Ferry surrendered Jackson received a message from Lee—who did not know of the surrender—to take position on the south bank of the Potomac at Shepherdstown and cover his crossing. Pendleton told me that Jackson replied he would join him at Sharpsburg. Equally I do not believe that General Jackson advised retreat across the Potomac at the end of the first day, for he wanted to attack on the second. I never heard of that until I read it in Col. Henderson's book. The author gives Sharpsburg full consideration and we cannot deal with it briefly, for it was not only the bloodiest battle of the war (except perhaps Chickamauga) but on the Confederate side it was the best fought.

When one reflects that Fitz-John Porter saved the Army of the Potomac at Richmond, and that "Baldy" Smith saved it at Antietam, it seems hard fate that, in the end, these two friends of McClellan were dealt with even more harshly than he was; and when the recollection is followed by another, that McClellan himself, the only man in that army who could have put it in shape to make the fight as it did at Sharpsburg, was summarily removed from command and the blunderer at Burnside's Bridge put in his place, language of surprise and disgust becomes bewildered. With a fresh corps of 13,000 men, Burnside should have routed Lee's army before Hill arrived; no words can do more than justice to Hill's great service just in the nick of time. No one who knew the field and the situation well and who was with Lee and Jackson in the stress of that last hour, just before Hill, in his red battle-shirt, threw his irresistible veterans into the breach, can agree with Col. Henderson in the mildness with which he treats Burnside's failure or the mild credit he gives to A. P. Hill. The author has told the full story of Fredericksburg, where Burnside fought and lost. I shall not stop at Chancellorsville where Stonewall Jackson died; it is a theme in itself and Col. Henderson has given to it his best thought and speech. It is interesting to note in passing that to the skill and activity of Fitzhugh Lee—of late, much in the eyes of our people—the author thinks "the victory at Chancellorsville was in great part due."

Col. Henderson's thrilling final chapter on Jackson as "The Soldier and the Man," his comments on the American generals, the two armies, their discipline, or want of it, and their general characteristics, we must leave without comment to the readers.

These two volumes will delight the soul of many an "old Confed.," although here and there the pages will grow dim and misty. The hours of the night will pass away in reading the fascinating pages, and when they are finished they will be laid aside with feelings akin to those of a little squad of old veterans who, found lying about the statue of Jackson at Richmond the morning after it was unveiled, gave as their reason—"We wanted to sleep with the old man just once more."

Hy. Kyd Douglas.

Ulysses S. Grant, his Life and Character. By Hamlin Garland. (New York: Doubleday-McClure Co. 1898. Pp. xix, 524.)

The content and method of Mr. Garland's book may be succinctly expressed by paraphrasing the title: The character of Ulysses S. Grant as revealed in the story of his life. Mr. Garland has not written a military history of Grant nor a political history of the years of his public career, although the latter field is not preoccupied. His book "is not perhaps everything that is understood by the word biography. . . . . It is an attempt at characterization." The treatment is not analytical, but purely narrative. One after another the scenes of Grant's life are passed in chronological order before the mind of the reader like objects before a sensitive plate. At the end a reflecting reader will find in his mind a composite picture of Grant's character more or less distinct.

This method need not be expected to commend itself to all. But some things can be said in its justification. Suffice it to say here that an enterprising writer and some enterprising publishers (of *McClure's Magazine*) have favored the public with an interesting and instructive story, though it be but a variation of a familiar theme.

The material for the period of Grant's public life was superabundant and had to be reduced. For the other periods new matter has been sought in newspaper files and by interviewing old acquaintances. Two-fifths of the space is devoted to the period before his capture of Fort Donelson and of national fame; another two-fifths to the period from 1862 to 1869; and the last one hundred pages to the remaining sixteen years of his life.

Sketched in briefest outline this is the man who is revealed to us in Mr. Garland's pages: Though reticent, he was not a dullard and was proficient in mathematics; he had great managing ability of a certain sort; the team he drove was the best kept and could haul the biggest loads of any in the neighborhood; he was a successful regimental quartermaster in the field with Taylor and Scott. He was cool, clear-headed and quick-witted in the emergencies of battle. His persistence was indomitable; defeats were but the occasions for making more adequate preparations. He made progress in military science; for, though he withdrew from Mississippi in 1862 because his communications had been cut at Holly Springs, a year later he boldly cast loose from Grand Gulf and took position between Vicksburg and Jackson, living on the country. He could discipline a regiment and he could direct to a remote object huge armies scattered over a vast territory. Grant was not disconcerted when Lee matched his movements day after day in Virginia; Thomas in Tennessee and Sherman in Georgia and North Carolina were embraced in the plan of that campaign as truly as the Army of the Potomac. Grant could judge the capacity of a mule-train or a regiment of soldiers, but he was not so good a judge of the character of individuals. He was gentle and without vindictiveness and, loving the whole Union, was considerate of the defenceless South.

He was conspicuously lacking in business ability. He had not political tact and sagacity; distrustful of politicians, he treated his cabinet much as he would his military staff. More democratic than Jefferson, he held that "the will of the people is the law of the land," not discriminating between the voice of the press and the lessons of an election. If he had not been so artless he would have been a demagogue. If Mr. Garland's opinion (p. vi) that "through all the complications" of his career as President, he "pursued a straightforward course" is taken literally, it is but half the truth. He was personally honest; but his administration was not. If it is meant for praise it proves too much. The man who could be honest and still overlook that "weltering chaos of political knaveries and double-dealings" was not a well-rounded character, was not suited to bear the responsibilities of the affairs of state, was not a statesman.

His intemperance is touched off in a few strokes, delicate as bold. It was an appetite which he and his friends contended against and which his enemies exaggerated. But Mr. Garland leaves it to others, if they can and must, to show when and where this weakness led to disastrous public consequences.

The popular reception accorded to Grant after the close of his presidency was as near to an apotheosis as could well be in this age. He was patriotic and sincere and by his military genius had done his country an undying service. For this his countrymen and world honor him, remembering nothing but good of their hero.

FREDERICK W. MOORE.

Memories of a Rear-Admiral, who has served for more than Half a Century in the Navy of the United States. By S. R. FRANKLIN, Rear-Admiral U. S. Navy (Retired). (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1898. Pp. xv, 398.)

ADMIRAL FRANKLIN in his *Memories of a Rear-Admiral* has given the reading world a very entertaining book. Sprung from a family of colonial and Revolutionary stock, and of note both in civil and military affairs, the admiral entered the navy as a midshipman in 1841, then being in his sixteenth year. His memories or reminiscences, therefore, cover a period of fifty-seven years—a period which has seen his active participation in two wars, and in which, as a looker-on from the ranks of the retired list, he has also witnessed, with all a seaman's glow of pride, the brilliant achievements of our navy in the recent war with Spain.

At the time of his entrance into the service the routine and methods on board our ships of war were substantially the same as those prevailing in the mother service—the British navy. The descriptions of Marryat and Cooper in their inimitable novels in portrayal of man-of-war life in the early days of the century well answered for both services. The cat and colt still swung with unabated vigor; grog still formed a part of the navy ration; drunkenness was too common a factor on shipboard, and the gait, dress and speech of the enlisted men bespoke with unmistakable vividness the characteristics of the old-time man-of-war's-man, when sailors were sailors, and steam had not yet destroyed their trade and individuality and relegated them from the heroic work of mast and yard to the tamer attendance in fire and engine-room. The glories of the naval victories over the arms of the Barbary Powers of the Mediterranean and of France and England in the first two decades of the century were still fresh in the minds of the people, constituting an incentive to duty and effort that has been a prime characteristic of our naval service ever since.

When, in 1842, after a brief initiatory service as a young midshipman, just caught, on board the old line-of-battleship *North Carolina* at New York, young Franklin was transferred to the frigate *United States* of glorious memory at Norfolk, Va., fitting out for a foreign cruise, he found himself in a new world, stern in its ways, inflexible in its methods, and trying in its influences. The crowded conditions of the quarters, the superior airs of the oldsters, their tricks of hazing and the scramble at table for the scant and limited variety of fare the mess afforded, soon convinced him that Peter Simple and Jack Easy had been no mythical characters, but that their like and kind were living entities on board every British and American man-of-war of that day. Under such conditions, he may at times have regretted the ambition that had been his to seek a naval life, but youth is ever buoyant and hopeful, and as he says, "After many trials and vicissitudes, he and his companions settled down to the regular routine of a man-of-war," and made themselves as comfortable and contented as the cramped and crowded environment and the necessity of putting up with many inconveniences and restrictions would admit.

It has been alleged by a distinguished officer of the service that the only aristocracy ever acknowledged by this government was the grade of midshipman in the navy. That was done in an official document by the Secretary of the Navy many years ago in which the midshipmen were called the "young gentlemen" of the navy. And it will be well within the recollection of Admiral Franklin that when the "officer of the deck," as he is called in our service, and "officer of the watch" in the British service, required the immediate or special attendance of the midshipman on deck, he would call out "young gentlemen of the watch, report to the first lieutenant or captain" this, that or the other thing as the case might be.

The grade of midshipman was instituted in the British service, from which we inherit our laws and methods, in Queen Elizabeth's time. Prior to her day and subsequently, until the sea-element had achieved full force and command, the guns of British fleets were principally manned and fought by soldiers, while sailors and a sailing-master, skilled in seamanship, handled, navigated and managed the royal ships in voyages and action. But the practical English folk, whose dependence was on the wave, noting the defects of such a system, determined to have a service purely of seamen for the defence of the kingdom and for the spreading of its influence upon the high seas. Elizabeth and her advisers eagerly took such a step towards naval development and dominance, and the grade of midshipman was created in furtherance of such end They, the midshipmen, the youth of good family, were to be taken on board Her Majesty's ships to occupy an apprentice position as it were, between the ship's company and the commissioned officers, for training in seamanship and navigation, in order to fit themselves for ultimate control and command. Their quarters were located between the two classes—hence the term midshipmen. The English, with slight modifications, have clung to this method of education for their naval officers to this day, taking in lads for the purpose from the early age of thirteen as the youngest limit permitted.

For a long time we followed England's example in that direction, but in 1845 the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. George Bancroft, by a straining of the law, established the Naval Academy at Fort Severn, Annapolis, Maryland. At first, the course for the oldsters, after five years' service at sea, was but one academic year, when they were graduated as passed-midshipmen, and regarded as eligible for commissions as lieutenants. In 1851 the system was radically changed, the order of going to sea having been reversed, and the scholastic term at the Academy extended to four years, brief cruises at sea in practice-ships during the summer months making substantially all the practical instruction in seamanship.

The frigate *United States*, the ship to which young Franklin had at first been ordered, made her cruise in the Pacific. During that cruise the war with Mexico occurred, in which Franklin had active participation on the coast of California. His cruise on that account was much prolonged, but he finally reached home in the *Levant* in season to go to the Naval Academy in 1847, from which institution he graduated in 1848.

The then superintendent was Capt. Upshur. Franklin says that he had an "unruly set of devils to manage, for we were no longer boys, most of us being more than twenty-one years of age." The *Memories* record much more in the same strain, by which we may know that the methods at the Academy at that time were crude and its discipline lacking in effectiveness. Since those days, the Academy has become one of the most efficient educational institutions in the country, as the records and achievements of its graduates amply attest.

In 1855 Franklin was promoted to the grade of lieutenant, and in the grade of lieutenant-commander, created during the Civil War, he saw continuous and gallant service under Admiral Farragut. Soon after the close of the war, he was promoted to the grade of commander, and after service in many directions, both ashore and afloat, he finally reached, in the spring of 1885, through the grades of captain and commodore, the then highest grade in the navy, the rank of rear-admiral, when he was given command of the European squadron, with the frigate-built sloop-of-war *Pensacola* as his flagship. After a most delightful cruise in European waters, his age of retirement having arrived, in 1887, he hauled down his flag and returned home.

In 1889 he was appointed by the Secretary of the Navy as a delegate to the International Marine Congress, which assembled in Washington during that year. His ability and high standing in the service were recognized by the members of that distinguished body by their making him its president by a unanimous vote.

Without any pretension to high literary style, Admiral Franklin has given us a very graphic and interesting work. The book is replete with incidents and anecdotes of service life, and descriptive of his acquaintance and association with many distinguished men and women in all parts of the world. The volume, as a chronicle of naval life during the past sixty years, is of great historic value, and well worthy of a place in every public and private library in the land.

GEO. E. BELKNAP.

Leading Events of Wisconsin History. The Story of the State. By HENRY E. LEGLER. (Milwaukee: The Sentinel Company. 1898. Pp. viii, 320.)

MR. LEGLER'S Archaean frontispiece recalls those scientists who urged one to whom St. Augustine refers, to tell them what God was doing before he made the world. The answer, *Alta scrutantibus gehennas parabat* (*Confess.*, XI. 12), was a snub which gave them little satisfaction. The picture shows Wisconsin when the Mississippi was still as broad as Lake Michigan and united with it on the south. It might well be displaced by a modern map which readers, ever learning but never coming to knowledge of geography, sadly miss, while they will never look twice at the geological vagary, or even revelation.

Among the topics of the fifty-five chapters are the red men, especially as mound-builders and copper-miners, then the fur-traders, missionaries, fun-lovers and other explorers, the wars of Indians with each other as well as with French, English and Americans, the beginnings of white settlement, its transitions through lead, copper and iron mining, to agriculture and lumber-work onward from Black Hawk's defeat (1832), polyglot and congregated or segregated immigrations from the old world, the romantic era of "a Bourbon among us," social Utopias, booms and tragedies, a nullification tempest in a teapot, the Underground Railroad, and then politics up to date.

These leading events are introduced by sensational headings, spiced with anecdotes, and all in such an engaging style withal that at whatever page we open we are drawn along to the end of a chapter.

Some chapters, however, treat of matters at a great remove from Wisconsin, indeed as far off in space as the Archaean era was in time. Five pages are consecrated to the capture of Jeff Davis because Wisconsin men chased him though they did not catch him, and because he once served in the state as a regular army lieutenant. Cushing's sinking the *Albemarle* in North Carolina fills a still larger space. The only excuse for such a claim to far-off laurels is that, though he entered the navy from New York, he was of Wisconsin birth. With equal and rather more reason whatever Napoleon achieved should be included in the history of Corsica. Much space is given to copper and iron mining and the Gogebic boom, which all had and have their local habitations mainly in Michigan.

It is an open secret that Mr. Legler's book was published *in extenso* by the *Milwaukee Sentinel* in its Sunday issues during the first half of 1897. All local history was then seasoned by seasonableness since the Wisconsin year of jubilee (1898) was at hand. Newspaper men—up to everything, down to everything—grasped at every historic "greasy relic" if connected with Wisconsin by any thread however attenuated. The whole series with errors which he who runs can read, and known to no one so well as the author—with all its imperfections, even misprints on its head—its lack-lustre cuts greatly the worse for wear—was bound up as a thesaurus of Leading Events.

A critic's first utterance would be that such a serial sent into this breathing world *after* its time yet scarce half made up, ought in vain to beg pardon for being born again, and revisiting the glimpses of the moon. It strikes him as many links but no chain—a kaleidoscope which, shake it as you will, cannot form a historic picture.

On second thoughts, however, one must be more charitable. The work is the last fruit of much research not merely in the infinite gatherings of the State Historical Society, but in corners hitherto undetected. It embodies local incidents which, if not beneath the dignity of a general history, are too multitudinous to find room in its ample pages, and yet sparkle each with its own glow-worm Röntgen light regarding the age and body of the time. Such a book in a corrected edition, twelve baskets of broken meat gathered up that nothing may be lost, deserves a place in those travelling libraries, the practical inauguration and advancement of which last year by the liberality of Mr. Stout, a Wisconsin citizen, will always be reckoned among the Leading Events in the annals of the state.

Legler has made a good initiative. His illustrations which are a full hundred will indubitably in as many bookless hamlets start questionings in children who cannot yet read at all; older children, and parents as well, will be thus roused to read that they may render answers. Appetite growing by what it feeds on will not be content without something better. *Leading Events* will not obstruct the circulation of Thwaites's

Story of Wisconsin, just now coming out in a new edition. They will double it, and also the popular interest in the county histories which already leave no corner of the land untouched. They will be welcome to many a reader who glanced at them in his daily, which perished before he saw it a second time. They will correct and complete the knowledge he failed to secure at first in the newspaper which was the perfume and suppliance of a minute, and where every something, being blent together, turned to a wild of nothing. In book-form they will be never out of the way and will live in his brain all alone and unmixed with baser matter.

JAMES D. BUTLER.

Introduction to the Study of History (New York, Henry Holt, pp. xxvii, 350) is a translation of the *Introduction aux Études Historiques* of Langlois and Seignobos, which appeared early in the year. The translator is Mr. G. G. Berry, and there is an introduction by Professor F. York Powell. The character of the original work has already been set forth by Professor Haskins in the April number of the REVIEW. Professor Powell has unstinted praise for the work. He knows of no book "wherein the student of history will find such an organized collection of practical and helpful instructions." For teachers it is "one of the most suggestive helps that has yet appeared." He is not always in accord with the authors when they deal with theory, but as regards practical work he finds himself "in almost perfect concurrence with them."

This preface of fifteen pages is something more than an excellent introduction to the book; it has a value of its own. "History," says Professor Powell, "must be worked out in a scientific spirit, as biology and chemistry are worked out." The literary critic is beginning to find that he reads a history at his peril; only the expert can judge of its value or lack of value. "It is not a question of style, but of accuracy, of fulness of observation, and correctness of reasoning, that is before the student." Nevertheless he believes with the authors that a book may be good science and yet be good reading, and that the historian has no right to use a faulty, careless or clogged style.

The work of translation has, upon the whole, been well done. It is faithful to the original, preserving well the spirit and style of the French. The French idioms have been replaced, usually, by good, racy English equivalents; indeed, one is inclined at times to think that some of them are almost too racy. On the other hand, occasionally something of the force and vigor of the original seems unnecessarily lost. But these are exceptions. The English reader may feel confident that he is not losing unduly either of form or thought.

The table of contents is a much better analysis of the contents of the book than that in the original; and an index of names has been added. In its English form the book will undoubtedly find a much wider field of usefulness than is possible for the French original.

Several typographical errors have been noted, but only one or two are at all serious: p. 192 (164) foot, *Traditions* for *Travaux*; p. 275 (238) foot, *Boardeau* for *Bourdeau*; p. 297 (257) foot, *Wedge* for *Wegele*.

E. C. B.

Duruy's histories are generally recognized as master-pieces of concise and vigorous narration, and translations of most of them have for some years been widely used. The newest addition to the list is *A General History of the World* (New York, T. Y. Crowell and Co., pp. xxvii, 744), translated and revised by Professor Edwin A. Grosvenor of Amherst College. Some modifications of the original have been made, chiefly in the way of abridgments of disproportionate material upon France. The chapter upon "The Three Eastern Questions (1832–1848)" has been rewritten by Professor Grosvenor in the light of later events and of modern knowledge. The section upon recent times, Professor Grosvenor's chief share in the work, is a "Summary of Contemporaneous History," continuing the narrative from 1848 to September, 1898, and comprising 166 pages. This "summary" is not by any means so dry as the word might suggest. A few of the chapters, such as that upon the minor states, and upon "The Partition of Africa, Asia and Oceania," are little more than summaries, but most of them are clear and judicious accounts of those events that are of wide or permanent significance. The narrative is spirited, and the writer does not withhold his opinions of men and measures; but his judgments are fair. There is perhaps no better sketch of the history of the half-century accessible in so small a compass. It would seem that the actual grounds upon which France declared war in 1870 ought to be definitely stated; and it would be inferred from the text that the dual control of Egypt by France and England began and ended in 1882. The chapter upon the United States is devoted almost exclusively to foreign relations, and is accordingly a good supplement to the ordinary text-book, which neglects these matters. The space devoted to English history is, throughout the book, very small, (this does not apply to Professor Grosvenor's addition in the same degree), a deficiency that makes it less adapted to American uses than it otherwise would be. This aside, the book is certainly superior in literary and scientific workmanship to most of the text-books of general history that are in use. There are twenty-four maps.

Professor Lloyd's *Citizenship and Salvation or Greek and Jew; a Study in the Philosophy of History* hardly falls within the province of this Review, since it is addressed rather to the philosopher than to the student of history. It belongs in the class of books about history which are of value not from their statement of the facts, nor even from their interpretation of the facts as actual history, for it is quite conceivable that two contrary interpretations of the sort should be of equal value, but from the stimulus which they give to the spiritual and imaginative, or at least to the speculative apprehension,—books whose outcome is not knowledge, but culture and ideals. The author attempts to trace through history certain ideal principles, seen first in the death of Socrates considered as "the positive event at Athens" and then "in a more abstract or a more spiritual sense, as fulfilled in the subsequent fate of Greece, when Greece was drawn into the Empire of Rome." Then we are led to see "the closest connection between the death of Socrates and the birth of Christ. . . . . In the wonderful logic of history they [appear] to us inseparable. Thus the death of Socrates was the birth of Christ." And finally "Christ at his death interpreted to itself the activity that Socrates sanctioned. And, as a result of the interpretation, organism began its struggle for liberation from the shackles of mechanism; and this struggle, beginning so long ago and continuing to the present day, has been a repetition in the life of human society of the career of Christ, a repetition of his struggle and a repetition of his death."

A Concise Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, based on Sir William Smith's Larger Dictionary, and incorporating the Results of Modern Research. Edited by F. Warre Cornish, M. A., Vice-Provost of Eton College. (New York, Henry Holt and Co., pp. vi, 829.) The merits of Smith's larger dictionary are well known and this editor, as rightful heir to the old material, has succeeded fairly well in compressing without suppressing unnecessarily. New articles, in fact, have been added and a number have been re-written. There have been added also two hundred new illustrations, some of the old being, at the same time, omitted. More space might have been gained by avoiding through cross-references the repetition of the same or similar illustrations, *e. g.*, cf. Fig. 127 with 697; Fig. 786 with 880. In general the cross-references should have been more complete: *e. g.*, Figs. 845 and 913 are both examples of the peculiar drinking-horns known as *rhyta*. Here we have not, as above, a repetition but a valuable addition; there is, however, no cross-reference to make them available together. And this suggests that a further cross-reference under the article "Eculeus," to one of these figures would have furnished a probable explanation of Cicero's sarcasm in *De Signis*, cap. XX.

Some articles are reduced dangerously near the baldness of the ordinary lexicons. In the case of this word ("Eculeus") indeed, the Latin lexicon gives us the additional meaning here neglected.

The tables of weights, measures, etc., are given in the Appendix without important change. Here the reader will at last, after consulting in vain the articles (s. v.), have his minas and drachmas changed into English (not U. S.) currency, and will be freed, perhaps, from the perplexities left in his mind by the articles in Liddell and Scott. The various articles on Greek and Roman law, hitherto scattered through the body of the work, are collected into an appendix at the end. This is a great advantage. The "many scholars who agree with Dr. Dörpfeld" will hardly feel content with the curt dismissal (article "Theatrum") of that brilliant scholar's arguments for his theory of the Attic theatre. It is to be regretted that brief bibliographies could not have been given after the more important articles, and also the provenance and interpretation of gems, vases, etc., used as illustrations.

A word as to the plan. The real desideratum for the limited purse is, as other editors have felt, a single book giving concise information, with the sources for more, about ancient life and language, men and things. The present strict classification implies the possession of three sets of dictionaries—Biography; Geography; Antiquities. This need is felt by the present editor, as may be inferred by the insertion of new articles like "Palaeography" (much to be commended, by the way, for the transliterating of the examples) and "Alphabetum" (thus partially recognizing the important subject of Epigraphy). These might well be supplemented by scores of articles like "Dialects;" "Indo-European Languages;" "Textual Criticism;" "Pergamene Sculptures" (illustrated and touched upon, p. 594); "Tanagra Figurines" (also illustrated, p. 619, but ignored in the text).

Further criticism might seem like ingratitude for what is actually given. Every educator must be glad to see this material brought within the reach of a largely increased number of readers.

F. G. ALLINSON.

Under the title *Ein Donaueschinger Briefsteller* (Innsbruck, Wagner, pp. xxiii, 75) Dr. Alexander Cartellieri, archivist at Karlsruhe, has brought to light a considerable collection of forms of correspondence preserved in the library of the Prince of Fürstenberg at Donaueschingen. The manuscript dates from the close of the thirteenth century and seems to come from the chancery of the archbishops of Salzburg, but most of the models can be traced back to the famous schools of rhetoric which flourished in and about Orleans in the twelfth century. In general the formulary does not differ widely from other "complete letter-writers" current in the later Middle Ages, but it contains some interesting allusions to French affairs in the early years of Philip Augustus, and its publication will facilitate the study of similar collections—a field in which there is still a great deal of comparing and sifting to be done before the historian can fully utilize the valuable material they contain. Only the more important of the three hundred and four models are published in full, but enough is always given to identify the letters and indicate the nature of their contents. Besides an excellent introduction the editor contributes indexes of proper names and *incipits*, a page of facsimile, and a bibliography of the Orleanese schools of rhetoric.

In this connection it may be noted that in a paper read before the Munich Academy last winter and published in its *Sitzungsberichte* since the appearance of Dr. Cartellieri's monograph, Professor Simonsfeld of Munich has examined two other manuscripts of the same general character and shown that they too consist of an original formulary from Orleans enlarged and adapted to meet the needs of German scribes.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

Mr. J. H. Round has "printed for private circulation only," a little book of 90 pages entitled *The Red Book of the Exchequer*, devoted to criticism of the recent edition of that document by Mr. Hubert Hall for the Rolls Series. He discovers what seems to be an abnormally large number of mistakes, and apparently convicts Mr. Hall of carelessness, confusion of thought, and unwarranted assumption of the truth of certain mere hypotheses. For instance, the editor of the *Red Book* bases a long explanation on what his critic declares is a mere mistaking of *praemissa* for *promissa*; again he confuses the regnal with the fiscal years through the period of two reigns; entries in the index do not correspond to the pages referred to, and statements in the preface are not borne out by the passages given in the text. Of course some of these charges might appear in a different light if Mr. Hall were heard in rebuttal. The final result of Mr. Round's attack on Mr. Freeman and the subsequent wearisome conflict with Mr. Archer and Miss Norgate some years ago was to modify very considerably the importance and value of Mr. Round's first criticisms. Nevertheless after all probable explanations by Mr. Hall shall have been made, and all reminders to Mr. Round of our common human fallibility have been given, it remains true that the editor of the *Red Book of the Exchequer* has not fulfilled his task with the accuracy, the self-restraint, and the finality of criticism which are so much to be desired, and which have adorned so many of the volumes of the Rolls Series. Mr. Round hints that these defects are so great as to require the withdrawal of the whole edition; but this is an absurdly extreme proposition, which is certainly not justified by the imperfections so far pointed out. No edition of any document is entirely free from blemish or question, and this will simply need to be used with extra care by the student, and in the last resort reference will have to be made occasionally to the manuscript itself.

But the propriety of the personalities in which Mr. Round indulges and of the general sarcasm which he adds to his criticism of individual points is quite another question. There seems to us no possible justification for this kind of writing. Material criticism of the text or valid charges against the method of editing might be trusted to speak for themselves without the constant personal application of these by the critic to the author. Readers of a review whose opinions are worth considering will probably be quite able of themselves to make the proper inference as to the ability of the author from the criticisms alone, without the critic's doing this for them. Mr. Round's reviews would be much more scholarly and useful, as well as more magnanimous and more courteous, if he had taken the space which he has devoted to attacks on Mr. Hall personally, and given in it a really complete list of the imperfections of the work under his observation. Such a list would be of real value to students who have occasion to use the *Red Book*, while his petty personalities are a vexation and a weariness to the flesh. Whatever may be the real reason for the necessity under which Mr. Round feels himself of printing his three reviews privately and at his own expense, there would seem to be considerable justification for the refusal of any editor to print reviews marked by so much personal animus.

The Romance of the House of Savoy, 1003–1519 (Putnam, two vols., pp. 258, 272), is likely to disappoint any historical student who goes to it for history of a solid kind. It does not pretend to give more than an anecdotal or gossipy account of the picturesque personages who made the House of Savoy conspicuous in its first centuries. The author, who writes under the name of Alethea Wiel, is already known by a rambling volume on Venice in the "Story of the Nations" series. Her present work belongs to that class of which the late Mrs. Oliphant's *Makers of Florence,* etc., were excellent types; but Mrs. Wiel, at her best, is better than Mrs. Oliphant. Although she indulges rather freely in sentimental reflections, she is not so voluble and redundant nor so regardless of syntax as Mrs. Oliphant was. English readers will find in her beautiful volume many stories familiar enough to the people of Piedmont, but scarcely known here. The various knights and ladies of the early generations of the House of Savoy, who by prowess in war or by marriage with European sovereigns made their lineage famous, are described in detail. Mrs. Wiel excels in such passages as the description of the Green Count's tourney, and the devotion of Empress Bertha, the wife of that Henry IV. who made the journey to Canossa. She has, further, fished out of the older sources a good deal of curious information; for example, the account of the "home surroundings" of the family, taken from fifteenth-century inventories; or the coronation of the duke-pope, Felix V., from the contemporary letter of Æneas Sylvius. Thus, although the book is addressed to the general reader, it has also something for the more exacting expert. The illustrations have a real historical value, except the portraits of the early Savoy princes, which are imaginary. We had noted for mention a few slips of statement, or misprints, but they are not likely to lead a serious reader astray, and need not be here set down.

Dr. Ferdinand Schwill's *History of Modern Europe* (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, pp. 434) narrates in three hundred and eighty octavo pages the story of Continental Europe and of England from the memorable Hallowe'en of 1517 to the assassination of the Czar Alexander II. (1881). An introduction of twenty-four pages, clearly written and interesting like the rest of the book, furnishes a viaticum for the hurried journey.

The more important genealogical tables and nine good maps are given in an appendix. The bibliographies are very brief, as they should be; they might, however, have been made better even in the same compass. We miss useful and well known books like Miss Putnam's *William the Silent*, De Tocqueville's *France before the Revolution*, H. Morse Stephens's *French Revolution*, Lowell's *Eve of the French Revolution*, the Countess Cesaresco's *Liberation of Italy*, any one of which is likely to prove more to the point that Burton's *History of Scotland* or even Carlyle's *Frederick the Great.*

The choice and treatment of the matter is disappointingly conventional. There is, indeed, a refreshing paragraph on Philip II.—no "Demon of the South" but "a slow plodding burgher, who took his business of kingship very seriously, and who, but for his radical intolerance, would have been as foreign to any kind of enthusiasm as the head of a bank." In general, however, Dr. Schwill has clung closely to the tradition of narrative political history. His book must be classed with the manuals of Dyer and of Lodge, not with M. Lavisse's *coup d' œil,* or Professor Adams's admirable *Growth of the French Nation.* There is the usual assumption made that if we set forth the most striking events clearly and sequentially they will explain themselves. Yet no one could discover the deepest significance of the French Revolution or account even partially for Napoleon's success from reading Dr. Schwill's narrative.

J. H. R.

Dr. Alfred Russell Wallace in *The Wonderful Century, its Successes and its Failures* (New York, Dodd, Mead and Co., pp. 400), does not claim to present a history, but rather an appreciation of the century, what it has done and what it has left undone. His intention is "to give short descriptive sketches of those great material and intellectual achievements which especially distinguish the nineteenth century from any and all its predecessors, and to show how fundamental is the change they have effected in our earth and civilization." The book, though suggestive and interesting as the product of a mind distinguished for its accomplishments in the field of physical science, is yet disappointing to one who looks to it for a well-balanced discussion of its main theme. The first part presents a series of discussions of the inventions and discoveries of the age, but the second portion is an extraordinary exhibition of hobby-riding, in which phrenology, spiritualism, opposition to vaccination, and universal panaceas for poverty play a part so exaggerated that, in spite of the author's eminence in his own field, it is impossible to take the whole book seriously as an estimate of nineteenth-century civilization. The best passage in the book is the history of the writer's own co-discovery with Darwin of the principles chiefly associated with the latter's name. His candor and generosity in recognizing Darwin as the principal discoverer are admirable.

Fustel de Coulanges, par Paul Guiraud, maître des conférences à l'École Normale Supérieure, professeur adjoint à la Faculté des Lettres de Paris (Paris, Hachette, 1896, pp. 272.)—The life of a scholar, pure and simple, does not afford much material for the biographer. Coulanges lived through some very dramatic scenes in French history, and yet scarcely more than the echoes of that outer world ever disturbed the placid atmosphere of the student. He was not unmindful of the stirring events passing in such rapid succession under his windows, and he pondered much upon the new problems which confronted the French people. But he was no such letter-writer as Freeman; he was never in the habit of passing offhand judgments upon men and measures; hence, the pages of his biographer can present nothing of the breezy freshness so marked in Stephens's *Life and Letters*. The story of Coulanges' life, therefore, a life singularly uneventful, and of itself soon told, an ideal life for the scholar, affords little more than a chronological setting for a series of reviews of his several works, arranged in the order of appearance and with some allusion to passing events. The book, however, is not without its value. It is the work of a loving and appreciative hand; yet the obvious and well-known faults of Coulanges are neither ignored nor glossed. The criticisms are fair; the estimates just. The student will find the book a most serviceable guide in assisting him to form an opinion of the value of Coulanges as an historian and critic. The list of chapter-titles shows the scope of the work: Les débuts (1830–1860), Le séjour à Strasbourg (1860–1870), *La Cité Antique*, *Études politiques* (1870–1871), Sur l'enseignement à l'École Normale Supérieure et à la Sorbonne, *L'Histoire des Institutions Politiques de l'Ancienne France*, Les polémiques de Fustel de Coulanges, Sa méthode historique, Sa philosophie de l'histoire, Études sur les questions sociales, Fustel de Coulanges écrivain, Les dernières années (1880–1889).

BENJAMIN TERRY.

A new edition of Eggleston's *Life of Major-General John Paterson* (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, pp. 488) was hardly to be expected within four years after its first publication, but the discovery of over one hundred letters to and from General Paterson has, in the author's opinion, justified a revision of the book. The book has grown from one of 293 pages to one of 488. Much the greater portion of this accession consists of letters and documents, many of them published for the first time; but extensive additions have also been made to the text. The letters are mainly from the Heath and Knox papers, but much new information respecting the life and services of General Paterson has been gathered from other sources.

The first chapter has been increased, but not to any important extent. Chapters II., III., and IV. (1774–1778), besides receiving accessions of text and documents, have been cut to pieces and the parts re-arranged or re-written. The result is a great improvement both from a chronological and (usually) also from a logical point of view. This is particularly true of the passages that deal with Ticonderoga and Saratoga. Moreover the brief mention, at the appropriate places, of the leading events in the progress of the Revolution brings the facts of General Paterson's service into clearer relation with events elsewhere. In later chapters this has not been done to the same extent.

The greatest amount of new material belongs to the years 1778 to 1783; accordingly the chapters (V. and VI.) upon this period have been almost entirely re-written. Indeed Chapter VI. (1780–1783) has become little else than a collection of letters to and from General Paterson, and letters, orders, etc., containing reference to him. Here the letters are allowed to tell their own story, with little comment from the author. Chapter VII. has also been overhauled and added to; Chapters VIII. and IX. have not been changed.

Much of this documentary material relates only to military routine or details of organization, but some of it has a broader bearing. The correspondence betweeen Generals Paterson and Heath, while the former was in chief or subordinate command at West Point (for example, General Paterson's letter of March 31, 1780, p. 214), is but another witness, if others were needed, of the terrible condition of the army and the country in those dark days.

Among the additions to the text may be noted fuller accounts of the operations on the Hudson, the British plan of campaign and the reasons for its failure, the American plans for defence (notably a history of the great chain and boom at West Point); also an account of the Conway Cabal (it seems strange, however, to hear that as late as May, 1780, "General Greene began openly to assert the incompetency of Washington, and to try to undermine him," p. 216), and a history of the Ohio scheme. Six new illustrations have been added and two appendices, one being the correspondence between Washington and Putnam relative to the Ohio lands. As a result of this new edition the part which General Paterson had in the war will be much better known.

One error in the first edition, repeated in the second, should be noticed. The Bank of England was not founded in 1692 (p. 1), but in 1694. William Paterson's scheme was presented in 1691, but was not acted upon until three years later. E. C. B.

Dr. Edward Stanwood's *History of Presidential Elections*, which reached its fourth edition in 1896, has been largely re-written and expanded, and now appears under the altered title, *A History of the Presidency* (Boston, Houghton, Mifflin and Co., pp. 586). The adoption of the more comprehensive title is due to a widening of the scope of the book. The greatest changes have, naturally, been made in the earlier chapters, which were somewhat meagre before. This is the result, partly of the altered plan of the book, and partly of the more extended studies which the author has made upon the earlier elections, since the book was first published in 1884. Not only are the accounts of elections more circumstantial, but we are told more of the conditions that preceded the elections, more of the circumstances that made a man available or unavailable as a candidate, more of the growth of parties and policies. As a conclusion to each of the earlier chapters is given a sketch of the inaugural ceremonies. The book has become not only more readable, but also more valuable, since more light is thrown upon the scene, and the scene is more astir with life and movement. If former opinions have sometimes been modified, opinion has been more freely expressed. The author is by no means so impersonal as he was. Yet one admires the keenness of his insight into causes and results, and the fairness with which the facts are usually set forth. The chapter upon the electoral system has been expanded to more than treble its former size, the chief feature of the expansion being an instructive consideration of the merits and defects of the system. The chief fault of the system, in the author's view, lies in the fact that the electors are state officers, and the only remedy, national control of elections, is, in the present state of public opinion, impracticable. Yet relying greatly upon plain national tendencies, Dr. Stanwood believes that the electoral system is about as sure to give effect to the national will as any that is likely to be devised; and its evils, he thinks, may be cured, if only there is a real desire to cure them.

A chapter (XIV.) upon "The Convention System" has been inserted. The view is taken that the convention is a natural and necessary outcome of political conditions, of the development of party organizations, and that, as a part of our machinery of election, it has an almost perfect adaptation to the end sought. A brief history of the development of the convention is given, and the prevailing methods of organization and procedure are described. A chapter has, of course, been added upon "The Free Silver Campaign." E. C. B.

Under the title *Modern American Oratory*, Mr. Ralph C. Ringwalt of Columbia University has united in one volume (New York, Henry Holt, pp. 334) an essay on the theory of oratory (comprising something like a quarter of the book, and presenting many useful suggestions), and seven representative public addresses. These are: Senator Carl Schurz's speech of January 30, 1872, on the bill for removing political disabilities; Judge Jeremiah S. Black's speech before the Supreme Court of the United States in the Milligan case, on the right to trial by jury; Wendell Phillips's eulogy of Daniel O'Connell; Mr. Chauncey Depew's oration on the one-hundredth anniversary of the inauguration of President Washington; the oration on the Leadership of Educated Men which George William Curtis delivered before the alumni of Brown University in June, 1882; Henry W. Grady's speech on The New South; and a sermon of Henry Ward Beecher's. The book, which is intended to serve as a manual for students of oratory, and to furnish both precept and illustrative matter for classes in argumentation and oral discussion, is provided with historical and other notes. The illustrations, however, are all drawn from the work of prominent public speakers in the United States during the last thirty years, an age surely not distinguished for excellence in oratory. It is not certain that students of oratory might not be better employed in the study of speeches that are more truly masterpieces of the first order, but no doubt they will, while they study, be learning something of recent American history.

The last historical publication of the State of New York is *Public Papers of Daniel D. Tompkins, Governor of New York, 1807–1817, Military*, Vol. I. (pp. 872), edited with an introduction by Mr. Hugh Hastings, State Historian. The principle of selection upon which this volume is made up is neither scientific nor fortunate. The Tompkins papers, acquired by the State of New York in 1885, include for some reason a considerable number of military papers belonging to earlier administrations. These to the extent of 37 pages are inserted at the beginning of the volume, though they are obviously but a fragment of the military correspondence of earlier governors and mar the unity of the book. On the other hand, the volume is, according to the editor's own statement, far from including what it should include if properly edited. It seems that the papers include fifteen bound volumes and a very large number of individual letters and loose papers. Volumes XI., XII. and XIII. of the collection are devoted exclusively to military subjects. Accordingly the editor, as if in haste to get together as large an amount of "copy" in as short a time as possible, puts into this present printed volume all the papers in these three manuscript volumes and no others, although he states that the remaining twelve volumes have, scattered through them, more or less material of a military character. These he proposes to gather together into a second volume. That is to say, if we understand him rightly, that the second volume will go over again in chronological order the years from 1800 to 1816, presenting papers which by all means ought to be arranged in one chronological series with the present set. The unhappy student will have to be perpetually turning from one volume to the other to compare papers which ought to be placed side by side. This will of course diminish greatly the use of the material. Under these circumstances it is perhaps fortunate that much of it has no use. Every paper found in the manuscript volumes attacked has apparently been printed, however trivial or formal. The editing consists of a historical introduction of most inferior quality abounding in irrelevancy and "state patriotism," and of supplying to each paper a heading. One has usually to turn over to the end of a document in order to find the name of the author or person to whom it is addressed. The editor's good taste and competency may be perceived if one quotes a few of his headings to the papers: p. 325, "The Usual Dispute Over Seniority;" p. 492, "In Spite of the Critical Condition of Affairs Officers Find Time to Quibble Over Rank;" p. 550, "Delightful Discretion Left to Officers in the Matter of Details in Uniform;" p. 556, "Snubbed by the Former Adjutant General;" p. 594, "General John Swift Evidently Years Ahead of His Time;" p. 649, "Questions That Seem Odd to the American of the Present Generation." It is fair to say that the volume of course contains a great deal of valuable material for the history of the participation of New York in the war of 1812.

It is not solely the inquirer into Virginian genealogies who will be interested in *The Vestry Book and Register of Bristol Parish, Virginia, 1720–1789*, which Mr. Churchill Gibson Chamberlayne, of Richmond, has transcribed and privately printed in an edition of five hundred copies. The volume (of 419 pages) contains, indeed, much material for the genealogist—births, baptisms and deaths from April, 1685, to March, 1798. But those, and they are now many, who are interested in the

NOTES AND NEWS

The author of the first article in the present issue of the REVIEW, M. Henri Hauser, is a *chargé de cours* at the University of Clermont, France.

Dr. William Kingsford died at Ottawa on September 29. Born in 1819, he spent his earlier life in the army, in journalism, and in surveying. His *History of Canada*, of which the first volume appeared in 1887, while the tenth (1836–1841) appeared during the year 1898, was not without evidences of the lack of special historical training in earlier life, yet has deserved much respect for laborious research and other solid excellences.

The American Historical Association holds its annual meeting at New Haven, on December 28, 29 and 30. The president is Professor George Park Fisher of Yale University; Professor E. G. Bourne of the same university is chairman of the committee on the programme.

Professor Charles Foster Kent of Brown University and Professor Frank K. Sanders of Yale are to edit the *Historical Series for Bible Students*, a collection of small volumes intended to serve as popular yet scholarly guides to the study of the history, the literature, and teaching of the Old and New Testaments, and of the contemporary history and literature. The series is to be published by Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons. The first two volumes of Professor Kent's *History of the Hebrew People*, which have already appeared, will constitute the first two volumes of the series. Others announced as in preparation are volumes on the history of the Jewish people in the Babylonian, Persian, and Greek periods by Professor Kent; on the Maccabean and Roman periods by Professor J. S. Riggs of Auburn Theological Seminary; on the Egyptians by Professor J. H. Breasted of Chicago University; on the Babylonians and Assyrians by Professor George S. Goodspeed of the same university; on the life of Jesus by Professor Rush Rhees of Newton Theological Seminary; on the Apostolic Age by Professor George T. Purves of Princeton Theological Seminary; and two volumes of outlines for the study of Biblical history and literature by Professor Sanders.

The New England History Teachers' Association met at Boston on October 15. Professor William MacDonald, chairman of a committee on text-books, presented a report on text-books of American history, which has been printed in the *Educational Review* for December. A report on the new Harvard entrance requirements in American history was presented by Mr. R. G. Huling, chairman of another committee. Addresses were delivered on lessons which history has to teach to the American people.

Professor William Cunningham of Trinity College, Cambridge, whose engagement at Harvard College from February to June has been mentioned in these pages, expects during the present year to complete the second part of his *Essay on Western Civilization in its Economic Aspects.*

ANCIENT HISTORY.

M. E. Revillout has published (Paris, Maisonneuve, pp. 153) the first volume of a treatise on *Les Actions Publiques et Privées en Droit Égyptien.*

The Palestine Exploration Fund has brought out, in a volume of 390 pages, an account by the American archaeologist Dr. Frederic J. Bliss of *Excavations at Jerusalem, 1894–1897,* chiefly conducted by him. The book is illustrated by plans and drawings by Mr. Archibald Campbell Dickie. The *Quarterly Statement* of the Fund for October contains a plan of the Lower Pool of Gihon by Baurath Schick, maps of the vicinity of Hebron and Jaffa, and photographs of Petra. Dr. Bliss resumes his work by excavations at Tell es Sâfi, a possible site of ancient Gath.

Dr. T. Witton Davies, professor at the Bangor Baptist College, Wales, has published through Messrs. James Clark and Co. a volume on *Magic, Divination and Demonology among the Hebrews and their Neighbors, including an Examination of Biblical References and of the Biblical Terms.*

In the *Jahresbericht* of the Humboldt Gymnasium at Berlin, for Easter 1898, Dr. S. Herrlich has an instructive monograph on *Epidaurus, eine antike Heilstätte,* in which the whole history of that town and its antiquities are surveyed, in the light of the excavations of Kavvadias and Staïs and of original investigations by the author. The cult of Asklepios naturally forms an important part of the subject-matter.

An important monograph in the field of Grecian historical geography, *Aetolia, its Geography, Topography, and Antiquities,* by Mr. William J. Woodhouse, F.R.G.S., abundantly illustrated with maps and reproductions of photographs, has been published by the Clarendon Press.

A translation of Boissier's *Roman Africa* is soon to be brought out by Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Under the title *The Romans on the Riviera and the Rhone,* the Macmillan Company publish a historical sketch of the Roman conquest and occupation of Liguria and Narbonensis by W. H. Bullock Hall, F.R.G.S.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Winternitz, *Witchcraft in Ancient India* (New World, September); M. Clerc, *De la Condition des Étrangers domiciliés dans les différentes Cités Grecques* (Revue des Universités du Midi, IV. 2); B. I. Wheeler, *Alexander the Great* (Century, November, December); B. W. Henderson, *The Campaign of the Metaurus,* II. (English Historical Review, October).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY.

In the *Catholic University Bulletin* for October Professor T. J. Shahan, D.D., has an article, the first of a series, on the Study of Church History.

The *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XIX. 1, contains a bibliography of publications in ecclesiastical history which appeared between July 1, 1897, and July 1, 1898.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: V. Ermoni, *L'Histoire du Baptême, depuis l'Édit de Milan jusqu'au Concile in Trullo* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); *The History of the Roman Breviary* (Church Quarterly Review, July).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

A young Belgian scholar, M. G. des Marez, has made an important contribution both to the history of medieval municipalities and to the social history of Flanders, by a volume entitled *Étude sur la Propriété Foncière dans les Villes du Moyen Age et spécialement en Flandre* (Ghent, the University, pp. 392).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: K. Breysig, *Gottfried von Bouillon vor dem Kreuzzuge* (Westdeutsche Zeitschrift, XVII. 2); J. Declareuil, *Les Preuves Judiciaires dans le Droit Franc du Vᵉ au VIIIᵉ Siècle*, I. (Nouvelle Revue Historique de Droit, XXII. 2); M. Dieulafoy, *La Château Gaillard et l'Architecture Militaire au XIIIᵉ Siècle* (Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, XXXVI. 1); J. Hansen, *Inquisition und Hexenverfolgung im Mittelalter* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXI. 3).

GREAT BRITAIN.

The British Government has published an additional volume of the *Calendar of the Close Rolls* for Edward III. (1330–1333); Vol IX. (1592–1603) of Mr. Horatio F. Brown's *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*; the thirtieth report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Records for Ireland; Vol. IV. (1694–1702) of the *English Army Lists*; a report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission on the manuscripts of the Duke of Somerset, of the Marquis of Ailesbury, and of the Rev. Sir S. H. G. Puleston, Bart.; and a volume (1540–1541) of the *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII.*

Professor Charles Gross, of Harvard University, hopes to publish next autumn his long-expected book on the *Sources and Literature of English History.*

A new edition of Bale's *Index Britanniae Scriptorum*, edited by Dr. Reginald Lane Poole and Miss Mary Bateson, is announced for issue in the series of *Anecdota Oxoniensia.*

Professor Frederic W. Maitland has published through Messrs. Methuen a volume of six essays (pp. 192) on *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England.*

In the Ex Libris Series Messrs. Bell and Company are to issue a volume on the Bayeux tapestry, fully illustrated and furnished with historical notes by Mr. Frank R. Fowke, of the Science and Art Department at South Kensington.

Rev. Dr. Edward L. Cutts has finished a volume entitled *Parish Priests and their People in the Middle Ages in England.* It is illustrated with photographic reproductions of illuminations from various manuscripts dealing with ecclesiastical ceremonies and clerical costumes, and is published by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge (pp. xvii, 519).

Father A. Hamy, in his *Entrevue de François Premier avec Henry VIII. à Boulogne-sur-Mer en 1532* (Paris, Gougy, pp. 212, ccccclviii) makes an important contribution to the history of the Divorce.

The second volume of the *Calendar of the Records of the Inner Temple*, embracing the period from 1603 to 1660, has been issued by that society with an extensive introduction by Mr. Inderwick.

The Scottish History Society has published the first volume of the *Diplomatic Correspondence of Jean de Montereul and the Brothers De Bellièvre, French Ambassadors in England and Scotland, 1645–1648*, reproduced from the archives of the French Foreign Office and edited by Mr. J. G. Fotheringham. The present volume consists chiefly of the letters of Montereul to Mazarin and casts much light upon the negotiations between the French, the Scots, and Charles I., which resulted in the King's joining the Scottish army.

The ninth volume of Mr. H. B. Wheatley's edition of Pepys is devoted to a minute index; but Mr. Wheatley adds a tenth and supplementary volume of Pepysiana, containing chapters of a general nature upon the Pepys family, London and the navy in Pepys's time, his personal characteristics, his will, his cypher, etc.

Mr. Edwin Hodder has edited from journals and papers placed in his hands by Miss Adelaide Gouger *The Founding of South Australia, as recorded in the Journals of Mr. Robert Gouger, First Colonial Secretary*, who co-operated with Wakefield and Torrens in the establishment of the colony.

The autobiography and memoirs of Dr. Charles Merivale, dean of Ely and historian of the Roman Empire, have lately been privately printed at the Oxford University Press. They have been edited by Miss Judith Merivale.

Mr. W. P. Reeves, agent-general for New Zealand, is at work upon a life of the late Sir George Grey, Mr. John Morley upon the authorized biography of Gladstone.

The Scottish Text Society will publish during the year 1899 an edition of the chronicles of Robert Lindsay, of Pitscottie, containing the first accurate text, from the best manuscripts, and additional matter unprinted hitherto, relating to the years from 1565 to 1575. The new edition is to be edited by Mr. Æneas Mackay, Q. C., sheriff of Fife and Kinross.

The Société Jersiaise has begun the publication of the *Actes des États de l' Ile de Jersey*, under the editorial care of Mr. J. Messervy. The records, it should seem, have a certain interest for students of the history of the American colonies. The two volumes now published extend from 1524 to 1605.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Sir H. H. Howorth, *The Beginnings of Wessex* (English Historical Review, October); Sir F. Pollock, *English Law before the Norman Conquest* (Law Quarterly Review, July); E. Bishop, *English Mediæval Institutes of Cathedral Canons* (Dublin Review, July); R. Aitken, *The Knight Templars in Scotland* (Scottish Review, July); *George Savile, Lord Halifax* (Edinburgh Review, October); J. G. Alger, *The British Colony at Paris* (English Historical Review, October); *Memoirs of Henry Reeve* (Edinburgh Review, October).

FRANCE.

The latest addition to the list of historical journals is one entitled *Souvenirs et Mémoires*, edited by P. Bonnefon and published at Paris by L. Gougy. It is to be devoted, as the name implies, to biographical materials—memoirs, autobiographical pieces, correspondence, etc. The first number, that for July 15, contained memoirs of Madame d'Épinay, letters of Carnot and Berthier, and a narrative by Dumouriez of his mission to Poland.

The French government intends, as a part of its celebration of the year 1900, to issue a history of French printing in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries by A. Claudin, which will be produced by the Imprimerie Nationale in the most perfect manner and will be supplemented with 1200 plates of reproductions from rare books.

The *Bulletin Historique du Protestantisme Français* for the months from April to July contains a varied assortment of articles commemorating, from one point of view or another, the tercentenary of the Edict of Nantes.

M. F. Masson continues his studies of the Bonapartes by a volume entitled *Napoléon et sa Famille, 1802–1805* (Paris, Ollendorff), full of the same elements of interest as his previous volumes.

Abbe Casteig's *La Défense d'Huningue en 1815 et le Général Barbanègre* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, pp. 138), though by an ecclesiastic, is commended as an excellent piece of military history and of research, by which the points most disputed with reference to the celebrated siege have been perhaps finally settled.

In the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for June 15, July 1 and 15, M. Ernest Daudet, making use of the papers of the Duc Decazes, prints three important articles on that minister and Louis XVIII.

Le Maréchal Canrobert; Souvenirs d'un Siècle, by Germain Bapst (Vol. I., Paris, Plon, pp. 560) is a memoir of an unusual type. Though in a sense it emanates from the marshal, it was not written by him. It was M. Bapst's practice to visit him almost every afternoon, and in the evening to write down what the marshal had told him. Canrobert's memory was excellent, and M. Bapst seems to have been a skilful reporter. He arranged in order the notes thus obtained, and showed the results to his subject, who revised them. They were also revised with the aid of original documents. The value of the book is therefore nearly that of autobiography; indeed in some respects its authority is greater.

M. Pierre Lehautcourt's *Siège de Paris* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, two vols., pp. 407, 439) is praised by the *Revue Historique* as the best history of the siege yet published.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Vicomte d'Avenel, *Paysans et Ouvriers depuis Sept Siècles*, III., IV. (Revue des Deux Mondes, June 15, July 15); Abbé J. Paquier, *L'Université de Paris et l'Humanisme au Début du XVI^e Siècle; Jérome Aléandre* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); G. Hanotaux, *Richelieu et Marie de Médicis à Blois* (Revue des Deux Mondes, Nov. 1); G. Lacour-Gayet, *Rapports de Louis XIV. et de Mazarin* (Revue Historique, November); A. Mathiez, *Étude Critique sur les Journées des 5 et 6 Octobre 1789*, II. (Revue Historique, November); F. A. Aulard, *Bourgeoisie et Démocratie, 1789–1790* (La Révolution Française, September 14); A. de Ganniers, *La Campagne de Luckner en Belgique en juin 1792, d' après des Documents originaux inédits* (Revue Historique, November); *La Constitution Girondine de 1793* (Révolution Française, June); H. von Zeissberg, *Pichegru und Condé in 1795 und 1796* (Sitzungsberichte der k. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien, phil.-hist. Cl., CXXXIX. 6); G. Roloff, *Napoleon und sein Invasionsprojekt gegen England, 1803–1805* (Preussische Jahrbücher, 1898, 2): F. Masson, *L'Existence d'une Impératrice; Joséphine aux Tuileries* (Revue des Deux Mondes, September 1, 15); Henry Houssaye, *La Bataille de Waterloo* (Revue des Deux Mondes, August 1, 15).

ITALY.

In the *Nuovo Archivio Veneto*, XIV. 2 and XV. 1, Professor Count Carlo Cipolla presents a bibliography of recent works on medieval Italian history.

In M. Paul Sabatier's series, *Collections et Documents pour l'Histoire Religieuse et Littéraire du Moyen Age*, of which we have heretofore spoken as opening with the *Speculum Perfectionis*, Nos. 2 and 3 are to be the *Actus S. Francisci et Sociorum ejus*, the Latin original of the *Fioretti*, and a critical edition of the *Fioretti* themselves.

Professor Camillo Manfroni has published (Rome, Forzani) a work of high importance in the naval history of Italy, *Storia della Marina Italiana dalla Caduta di Costantinopoli alla Battaglia di Lepanto.*

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. von Bezold, *Republik und Monarchie in der italienischen Literatur des 15. Jarhunderts* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXI. 3); A. Reinhart, *Savonarola* (American Catholic Quarterly, October).

GERMANY, SWITZERLAND.

In the *Neues Archiv*, XXIII. 3, Dr. K. Hampe finishes his report of his investigations in France and Belgium in 1897; in XXIV. 1, Professor Mommsen prints a final report on the *Auctores Antiquissimi*. This number also contains important studies by P. Scheffer-Boichorst on the Regesta of the period of the Hohenstaufen.

The latest publication of the Historical Commission of Baden is Dr. K. Beyerle's edition of *Die Konstanzer Rathslisten* (Heidelberg, Winter), which, over and above the materials which the title implies, contains much that is useful toward the history of medieval German municipalities.

The Thuringian Historical Commission contemplates publishing the matriculations of the University of Jena, a series of municipal law-codes, and the proceedings of the Landtage of the Ernestine states from 1486 to 1547 (those previous to 1485 falling within the scope of the *Codex Diplomaticus Saxoniae Regiae*).

The Historical Commission for Hesse and Waldeck expects to put forth, as its first publication, the first volume of an *Urkundenbuch* of Fulda, edited by Tangl. The chronicles of Hesse and Waldeck, calendars of the state-papers of the landgraves, the proceedings of the Landtag, a dictionary of local names, local cartularies and a historical book of costumes are to follow.

The military movements in Bavaria leading up to the battle of Blenheim are ably studied, from original sources, largely unprinted, in a monograph by Major-General von Landmann, *Die Kriegführung des Kurfürsten Max Emanuel von Baiern in den Jahren 1703 und 1704* (Munich, C. H. Beck).

In the *Programm* (1898) of the Kneiphof Gymnasium at Königsberg Dr. Gottlob Crause discusses, upon the basis of extensive studies in Prussian archives, the administration of Freiherr von Schroetter in East Prussia and his relation to Stein's reforms.

The participation of the Prussian auxiliary corps in the campaign of 1812 against Russia is the subject of detailed and scientific treatment in No. 24 of the monographs of military history published by the historical section of the Prussian General Staff.

A translation of Dändliker's *History of Switzerland* is soon to be issued by the Macmillan Company.

Dr. E. Bloesch has published the first of two volumes in which he proposes to treat the history of the Protestant churches in all the Swiss cantons from 1531 to 1870, *Geschichte der schweizerisch-reformierten Kirchen* (Bern, pp. 500).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM.

A committee of nine scholars, Dutch and Belgian, including Professor P. J. Blok of Leyden and Professor Paul Fredericq of Ghent, has been formed for the preparation of a comprehensive historical atlas of the old Netherlands.

The association of Dutch archivists having appointed a committee to prepare a plan for securing uniformity in the scientific organization of the various Dutch archives, the committee, Messrs. Feith, Fruin and Muller, have made their report in a considerable volume, submitted to the association for discussion.

Since the Council of Brabant had powers both executive, legislative and judicial, of greater extent than most of the provincial councils, a great importance attaches to the careful work, *Le Conseil de Brabant: Histoire, Organisation, Procédure,* of which the first volume has been published by M. Arthur Gaillard, assistant archivist-general of the kingdom of Belgium. The book (Brussels, Lebègue, pp. 402) rests upon materials in the archives of the Council and in those of the Chamber of Accounts of Brabant.

Professor Paul Fredericq has published a second volume (Ghent, Vuylsteke, pp. 195) of his *Geschiedenis der Inquisitie in de Nederlanden.* This instalment relates to the fourteenth century.

Messrs. Muller and Diegerick have published the fourth volume (January, 1581, to March, 1583) of their *Documents concernant les Relations entre le Duc d'Anjou et les Pays-Bas* (Werken van het Historisch Genootschap te Utrecht, n. s., LX.). A fifth volume, extending from March, 1583, to the duke's death, will complete this important series.

Thirty-six of the most prominent Dutch statesmen, historians, artists, and men of science have co-operated in the preparation of a work on the political and social history of the Netherlands during the last half-century, a collection of monographs forming two volumes with the title *Een Halve Eeuw, 1848–1898.*

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE.

Of the recent Swedish historical publications the most important are: *Sveriges Ridderskaps och Adels Riksdagsprotokoll,* XIV. (1682–1683); E. Hildebrand's *Svenska Statsförfattningens Historiska Utveckling från äldsta Tid till våra Dagar*; J. Mankell's *Krigshistoria 1592–1611;* Vol. I. of Wimarson's *Sveriges Krig i Tyskland* (1675–1679); C. G. Malmström's *Sveriges Politiska Historia från Konung Karl XIIs Död till Statshvälfningen 1772,* Vol. III.; and Professor C. T. Odhner's *Sveriges Politiska Historia under Konung Gustaf IIIs Regering,* Vol. II. (1779–1787).

The Archaeological Society of Moscow has established "an archaeographical commission," the function of which is to print reports upon the contents of the lesser public and the private archives of Russia—*anglice,* a Historical Manuscripts Commission.

In a supplement to the Michaelmas programme of the University of Greifswald Dr. H. Ulmann makes a critical investigation into the credibility of the memoirs of Prince Adam Czartoryski, summing up in their favor, and examines the plans of Alexander I. respecting Poland, especially in 1805.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. Miller, *Bosnia before the Turkish Conquest* (English Historical Review, October); E. Rodocanachi, *Les Iles Ioniennes sous la Domination Russe et sous la Domination Française, 1799–1814* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, 1898, 4).

AMERICA.

The Old South Lectures last summer related chiefly to the non-English elements which in early days entered into the making of the American Republic. The leaflets issued in connection with these lectures presented the account of the founding of St. Augustine, by Francisco Lopez de Mendoza Grajales; Amerigo Vespucci's account of his third voyage; Champlain's account of the founding of Quebec; Barlowe's account of the first voyage to Roanoke; Parker's account of the settlement of Londonderry, N. H., by the Scotch-Irish; Juet's account of the discovery of the Hudson River; Pastorius's description of Pennsylvania, 1700; and Acrelius's account of the founding of New Sweden.

In the *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society at the meeting of April 27, 1898, Senator Hoar prints an interesting account of the fête which Joseph Bonaparte gave after the signing of the treaty of Morfontaine, with interesting glimpses of the First Consul, derived from the papers of William Vans Murray. Dr. Cyrus Hamlin has a paper on the Armenian Massacres.

The burning of a printing house in Dublin, Ireland, on October 12, caused the destruction of the plates and sheets of a new work by the Very Rev. Canon O'Hanlon, entitled *A History of the Irish in the United States down to the present Time*. Fortunately the author had proofs of his work, which is therefore likely to be issued before very long.

Mr. Fred. W. Lucas has made a new and elaborate examination of the story of the Zeni brothers, in the light of new materials which have been made accessible since Major's book was published in 1873. His results are published (London, Henry Stevens Son and Stiles) in a sumptuous volume entitled *The Annals of the Voyages of the Brothers Nicolò and Antonio Zeno in the North Atlantic about the end of the Fourteenth Century and the Claim founded thereon to a Venetian Discovery of America*. The edition is limited to 400 copies. The book will have 234 pages of letter-press, eighteen full-plate maps, and as many more in the text. Mr. Lucas's conclusions are adverse to the credit of the younger Zeno's account.

Of considerable interest and importance to students of early American history is the inaugural lecture with which Professor Luigi Hugues opened his geographical course at Turin in January, and which has now been printed, *Le Vicende del Nome America* (Torino, Loescher).

Mr. Edwin V. Morgan, now at work on a history of the diplomatic service of the United States, desires the loan of documents and letters bearing on this subject. He proposes to publish a complete list of all individuals who have at any time been employed in any diplomatic capacity, and would be obliged especially for the names and addresses of any persons, or the descendants of any persons who have served, with or without official nomination, as attachés to legations, or as private secretaries (with diplomatic rank) to a diplomatic representative—since the names of these do not appear in the *Official Register*. Address Aurora, Cayuga Lake, N. Y., or Cascadilla Building, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

Messrs. George Barrie and Son intend to issue in twenty-five parts of sixteen pages each a history of the army and navy of the United States, illustrated by 300 pictures in the text and fifty full-plate photogravures of the uniforms worn by soldiers and sailors and of ships famous in the American service. The work has the aid and official approval of the United States government. The supplement will contain more than 200,000 names of all officers in active service from 1775 to the present time.

Mr. Charles Henry Hart brings out, in a limited edition of 400 copies (Doubleday-McClure Co.), a handsome illustrated work on *Browere's Life Masks of Great Americans*, discovered by him. The book will be printed by DeVinne, and will contain reproductions of the most important of the masks.

Professor James A. Woodburn, of the Indiana University, has selected from Mr. Lecky's *History of England in the Eighteenth Century* the chapters and passages relating to America, has arranged and edited them with historical and bibliographical notes, and has issued the book for school use through Messrs. D. Appleton and Co. with the title *The American Revolution*.

Mr. Paul Leicester Ford is about to bring out through Messrs. Dodd, Mead and Company an edition of Mason L. Weems's *Life of Washington*, with annotations and bibliographical apparatus, in similar form to that of his book on the *New England Primer*.

The Century Company has brought out a new edition of Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*, the translation by Reeve edited by Bowen, to which they have prefixed an introduction by President Gilman of Johns Hopkins University, contributing some interesting biographical matter and other details adapted to promote the understanding of Tocqueville's book in its relation to the times in which it was written.

Mr. William M. Meigs is engaged upon a life of Senator Thomas H. Benton and will be greatly obliged to any person who possesses letters of Benton if he may have the opportunity of borrowing and copying them. His address is 216 South Third Street, Philadelphia.

Mr. Henry F. Brownson of Detroit is at once author and publisher of a partial biography of his father, *Orestes A. Brownson's Early Life, from 1803 to 1844*.

The eighth volume of Mr. James D. Richardson's *Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789–1897* (Washington, the Government Printing Office, pp. 852) covers the eight years from March

4, 1881, to March 4, 1889. The plan differs nowise from that of the preceding volumes. The demand for the *Compilation* exceeds what was expected; an arrangement has been made whereby copies can be bought, the plates being used for a much larger edition than that originally provided for congressional distribution.

Professor Carl C. Plehn of the University of California has reprinted from the University Chronicle, in a clear and interesting pamphlet of 45 pages, three lectures on the *Finances of the United States in the Spanish War.* They can apparently be obtained from the University.

Mr. John Noble, clerk of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetti, has for some time been engaged in superintending the important work of arranging and indexing the papers preserved in the clerk's office. The collection consists of some 500,000 papers bound up in about 1200 large volumes. It comprises pleadings, exhibits, depositions, copies of records, deeds, wills, correspondence and miscellaneous papers, and illustrates historical, genealogical, topographical, and antiquarian matters throughout the period from 1629 to 1800. A part of the collection, chiefly the latter part, retains its original file arrangement, but about a half was in confusion. The work of arrangement and indexing was begun fifteen years ago and is still going on. An extensive account of the work and of the papers will shortly be published in the *Transactions* of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts.

The selections from the letter-book of John Hancock which ran for some time in the *Boston Transcript* have now been gathered into a book by Mr. Abram English Brown. It is entitled *John Hancock, His Book,* contains much biographical and explanatory matter by the editor, and is published by Lee and Shepard (286 pp.).

The late Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull bequeathed to the American Antiquarian Society the manuscript, nearly completed, of a dictionary of the language of the Massachusetts Indians. The Society has made arrangements with the United States Bureau of Ethnology whereby the dictionary shall be printed under the editorial care of Mr. Albert S. Gatschet of that bureau. Dr. Trumbull's well-known scholarship in the Indian languages will doubtless make the book a standard.

The October number of the *Publications* of the Rhode Island Historical Society contains an article by the Hon. Amos Perry on early commercial signs in Providence and one by Hon. A. B. Gardiner on the Havana expedition of 1762. It has also a list of the vessels belonging to the port of Providence in 1791, with their tonnage.

Mr. William Nelson, chairman of the Public Records Commission of New Jersey, has recently discovered the record of the proceedings of the West Jersey Assembly in 1682. The Commission have employed Mr. Berthold Fernow to make a calendar of the early records in the office of the Secretary of State at Trenton. Those of East Jersey and West Jersey anterior to their union are nearly completed. It is hoped that the calendar will be printed in the *New Jersey Archives*: Vol. XX. of that series, containing newspaper extracts relating to New Jersey, 1756–1761, and a history of New Jersey printers and printing prior to 1800, is nearly through the press. Vol. XXI. of the same series will contain an index to the marriage bonds in the office of the Secretary of State at Trenton and indexes to the marriage records of several counties prior to 1801. This volume also is nearly printed.

A letter of Benjamin Rush, printed in the *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library for November, proves that the articles signed "Scaevola" and "Hampden," in Bradford's *Pennsylvania Journal* for October 13 and 20, 1773, were written, the former by Mifflin, the latter by Rush.

The October number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History* contains an interesting investigation of the origin of the Council of Censors and of its history in Pennsylvania, 1776–1790, by Mr. L. H. Meader; a body of extracts from the journal of one who surveyed land in northeastern Pennsylvania in 1797; and the conclusion of Mr. Howard M. Jenkins's account of the family of William Penn, which last is to appear before long in book-form.

Several matters of interest are presented in the October number of the *Virginia Magazine of History*: a series of early wills from Isle of Wight County; an interesting letter of Richard Bland on Virginian affairs in 1771 (but surely much lack of editing is shown when in a Virginian magazine the name of Rev. Mr. Horrocks is constantly spelled Howocks); a vindication of Sir William Berkeley, and a poll of Frederick County at the election of 1758, when Col. George Washington was chosen to the House of Burgesses. Mr. Alexander Brown's *First Republic in America* is reviewed at length by Mr. William Wirt Henry.

The latest issue in the series of *Johns Hopkins University Studies* is a monograph by Professor E. W. Sikes on The Transition of North Carolina from Colony to Commonwealth.

In 1844 the Historical Society of the University of North Carolina was organized by Governor Swain and others. But neither that association nor the North Carolina Historical Society, (if that was a different body, of which we are not sure), has maintained an active existence for some years past. On April 20, 1893, the North Carolina Historical Society was re-organized, at a meeting held at Charlotte. Dr. Dred Peacock of Greensborough was made president, and Mr. E. H. Bean of Charlotte secretary and treasurer.

The *Charleston Year-Book* for 1897 contains, as is usual, a historical appendix, by Hon. William A. Courtenay. It consists of a body of material, from uncommon books or from original manuscripts, relating to the history of the siege of Charleston in 1780: a history of St. Mary's Church (Catholic) by its rector, Dr. Thomas F. Hopkins; and extracts from the history of Easton, Mass., relating to the missionary expedition to South Carolina in 1695.

Rev. Dr. A. M. Chreitzberg has prepared an extensive and careful account of the early history of Methodism within the limits of the old South Carolina Conference, whose territory was South Carolina, with certain parts of North Carolina and Georgia. The book has been written at the invitation of the present conference and, under the title *Early Methodism in the Carolinas* (pp. xiv, 364), has been published by the Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church South.

A *History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Alabama*, by Rev. Walter C. Whitaker, rector of Christ Church, Tuscaloosa, extending from 1763 to 1891, has been published at Birmingham by Roberts and Son.

Dominique Rouquette's manuscript history of the Choctaws, a work of much value and interest, which had been supposed to have been destroyed by fire, has been lately deposited in the Howard Memorial Library at New Orleans.

In the October number of the *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* the most important article is one by Mr. John C. Townes on the Development of the Judicial System of Texas, in which the subject of his former article is continued from the year 1845 down. An article by the late Judge Roberts, unfinished, deals with the Capitals of Texas. The same subject is really the chief theme of Judge C. W. Raines's second article on "The Enduring Laws of the Republic of Texas."

The next publication of the Caxton Club of Chicago will be the *Relation of Henri de Tonty concerning the Explorations of La Salle from 1678 to 1683*, translated by Mr. Melville B. Anderson.

The *Annals of Iowa* for October is mainly occupied with a series of articles on the Spirit Lake Expedition of 1857.

The Historical Department of Iowa has printed, under the editorial care of Professor Benjamin F. Shambaugh, the *First Census of the Original Counties of Dubuque and Demoine taken in July, 1836*.

The Duc de Loubat has caused the Borgia Codex, a Mexican ritual manuscript belonging to the Propaganda, to be reproduced in chromophotography under the supervision of the Vatican Library. The volume is entitled *Il Manoscritto Messicano della S. Congregazione di Propaganda Fede riprodotto*, etc.

In the most recent annual report of the Historisch Genootschap te Utrecht Mr. George Edmundson publishes General William Byam's report of the conquest of Paramaribo in 1665; Mr. Kernkamp prints some documents relating to the history of the Noord-Compagnie.

Messrs. Hume and Company of Santiago de Chile have republished from Vol. 97 of the *Anales de la Universidad de Chile* the *Bibliografía Española de las Islas Filipinas, 1523–1810* (524 pages) by Señor J. T. Medina. The bibliography contains 667 titles and is fully indexed.

The early expeditions of the Dutch against the Philippines are chronicled by Mr. Sloos in an Amsterdam thesis, *De Nederlanders in de Philippijnsche Wateren vóór 1626*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Beauvois, *La Contrefaçon du Christianisme chez les Mexicains du Moyen Age* (Le Muséon, 1898, 3–4); H. de Charencey, *Le Historien Sahagun et les Migrations Mexicaines* (*ibid.*); W. G. Sumner, *The Coin Shilling of Massachusetts Bay*, I. (Yale Review, November); R. R. Elliott, *The Recollets at Detroit during the Eighteenth Century* (American Catholic Quarterly, October); A. M. Davis, *A Connecticut Land-Bank of the Eighteenth Century* (Quarterly Journal of Economics, October); *Loyalists of the American Revolution* (Quarterly Review, October); P. L. Ford, *The Many-Sided Franklin* (Century, November); L. Vignols, *L'Esclavage aux Antilles Françaises avant 1789* (Revue de Géographie, September); R. P. Falkner, *The Development of the Census* (Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November); L. Sciout, *La Révolution à Saint Domingue: Les Commissaires Sonthonax et Polverel* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); L. G. Bugbee, *Slavery in Early Texas*, I. (Political Science Quarterly, September); R. D. Hunt, *The Legal Status of California, 1846–1849* (Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November); D. S. Jordan, *Colonial Lessons of Alaska* (Atlantic, November); G. H. Haynes, *Qualifications for the Suffrage* (Political Science Quarterly, September); J. F. Crowell, *Railway Receiverships in the United States, their Origin and Development* (Yale Review, November).

Volume IV] *April, 1899* [*Number 3*

The

American Historical Review

THE NEW HAVEN MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

ALL who habitually attend the sessions of the American Historical Association seemed to agree that its fourteenth annual meeting, held at New Haven on December 28, 29 and 30, 1898, was the most interesting and successful in its history. After each of its recent meetings similar expressions have been current; and it is evident that the Association is rapidly moving forward, with constant increase of activity and usefulness. Its members, who three years ago numbered 629, now number about twelve hundred. The treasurer's report, submitted at New Haven, showed that the funds of the society amounted to more than $11,000, and that they had increased about $1,500 during the preceding twelvemonth. Still better evidences of progress are presented by the new activities and responsibilities which the organization, while maintaining its traditional functions, is annually assuming. The foremost place among these new duties we may, without apology, assign to those which the society has undertaken with reference to the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW.

From its inception, in the summer of 1895, the REVIEW was sustained by the aid of a three years' guarantee on the part of a body of generous friends of historical learning. At the Cleveland meeting of the American Historical Association proposals were made looking toward the substitution of that body for the Association of Guarantors, or toward securing, upon some other basis, the benefits of union. While favoring the general project, the Association did not feel at liberty to commit its members to any definite plan without further opportunity to consult them. Accordingly a vote was adopted whereby each member of the Association was to be supplied with the first two numbers of the REVIEW issued after the expiration of the guarantee fund (those for October 1898 and January 1899) while a definite decision of the question was postponed to the New Haven meeting. Upon that occasion it was concluded, in view of the excellent showing made by the treasurer, that the Association could safely, without increasing its annual dues, enter into the desired relations with the REVIEW. It was, therefore, agreed that the Association would subscribe for the REVIEW for all its members, assuming, however, no further pecuniary responsibility; and that hereafter the members of the Board of Editors, as their terms expired, should be elected by the Council of the Association. This agreement may, upon one year's notice, be terminated by either party. By this generous action on the part of the Association the REVIEW is assured of permanence, while its editors retain all desirable freedom of action.

Among the other transactions which must be noted as steps of progress was the formation of a committee for the historical study of colonial dependencies, and especially of the methods employed by other countries in their management, and in the training of men for their administration. The chairman of this committee is Professor Henry E. Bourne of Cleveland; its other members, appointed for reasons of obvious fitness, are Professor Bernard Moses of the University of California, Professor H. Morse Stephens of Cornell University, Professor George M. Wrong of the University of Toronto and Mr. Frederick Wells Williams, instructor in Oriental history in Yale University. This committee, whose investigations may properly be expected to be of much interest and utility to the general American public, will probably bring out a somewhat elaborate historical and bibliographical report late in the present year, before the next meeting of the Association, and perhaps before the next meeting of Congress.

The Association took another important step in the appointing of a bibliographical committee,—Mr. William E. Foster of the Providence Public Library, chairman, Mr. J. N. Larned of Buffalo, Mr. Reuben G. Thwaites, secretary of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Mr. George Iles of New York and Mr. A. Howard Clark, assistant secretary of the Association,—whose function is to supervise the bibliographical work of the Association, often an extensive part of its publishing activity, and to devise and execute plans of larger usefulness in this direction. Not less important to the future progress of the Association is the creation of a numerous "General Committee," the members of which, under the chairmanship of Professor Herbert B. Adams, Secretary of the Association, are to take care of its local interests in their respective states or cities, to act as a committee on membership, to answer historical inquiries, or to put members into communication with those who can answer them, and to serve the Secretary and the Association in various ways. The Association also, reviving its bestowal of an annual prize for a historical monograph, gave it the appropriate name of the Justin Winsor Prize in memory of the third president of the society. Professor Frederick J. Turner, of Wisconsin, was made chairman of the committee on this prize.

These are the new activities of the society. Of the tasks which it had already undertaken, there was none which, apparently, was regarded with so general interest as that of the Committee of Seven on the teaching of history in secondary schools. Unquestionably a considerable part of this manifestation of interest on the part of the audiences was due to the fact that the New England History Teachers' Association was gathered together in New Haven at the same time. At the Cleveland meeting the Committee of Seven had made a preliminary report which, without yet formulating conclusions in perfect detail, had impressed all hearers with the thoroughness of the committee in its search for information as to the actual facts of historical teaching in schools, with its determination to make practical recommendations, based on experience and on the actual situation, and with the certainty that the results of its labors, when finally brought forward, would prove to be of high professional value. This impression was confirmed by what the committee presented at New Haven. From their report, nearly completed after many and arduous sessions, the chairman, Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin of Michigan, read considerable extracts at one of the sessions. So general was the desire to hear more, that a special time and place were appointed in order to give opportunity for this.

The report first gave an account of the work of the committee, and a brief statement of the conditions found to exist in the schools of the country. It discussed the educational value of history and its place in the curriculum. Declining to recommend the use of a short course in general history, the committee recommended that the historical teaching in secondary schools relate to one or more of four tracts or periods of history: Ancient History, including Oriental beginnings and continuing the study into the medieval period so far as to the end of the reign of Charlemagne; Later Medieval and Modern European History; English History; and American History. The report discussed the various methods which might best be employed in teaching each of these portions of history, laying stress upon the value of history in cultivating the judgment and reasoning powers.

Views upon the training of teachers were also expressed in the report; and it concluded with a section, toward which in a sense all the rest had led, upon college entrance requirements in history. The recommendation of the committee was that history should be treated on terms of equality with the other subjects now required; and they developed their views as to how this proposition could or should be worked out under the varying systems of requirements for entrance which prevail in American colleges. The public discussion of the report was hampered by the fact that, after all, it was presented only in fragments. President Levermore of Adelphi College urged that, so far as presented, it seemed to ignore the standing dilemma in which secondary schools are placed by the enthusiastic advocates of this or that study,—that if the schools should try to meet the sum of all their demands, the scholar's whole time would be engrossed many times over. But as to the details of what will be found, or what may not be found, in the committee's report, it is possible for us to refer to the text of the report itself; for it was concluded not to wait upon the slow operations of the Government Printing Office, but to bring out the report, as a duodecimo volume of 150 or 175 pages, through a publisher (the Macmillan Co.) this spring. The volume, which surely will be ardently expected, will contain, beside the chapters already mentioned, a series of appendixes or special contributions. One will present typical replies to the committee's circulars; another, typical school-programmes. Another, by Miss Lucy Salmon, professor in Vassar College, a member of the committee, will delineate from abundant personal observation the methods and the results of historical teaching in the German gymnasia. Others will deal in a similar manner, though less elaborately, with the systems in vogue in France, England and Canada; others still with the possibilities and the appropriate methods of historical instruction in schools of lower and of elementary grade. An extensive bibliography of the study and teaching of history will also be appended. The section relating to historical requirements for entrance to college will also be used as a report on that subject to the National Educational Association's committee on uniform entrance requirements, the committee of which Mr. A. F. Nightingale of Chicago is chairman.

Another report formally presented to the Association was that of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, read by its chairman, Professor J. Franklin Jameson. The Commission had expected to present on this occasion the manuscript of their edition of the Correspondence of John C. Calhoun. But almost at the last moment a considerable mass of additional material was placed at their disposal and still more appeared to be within reach. To secure the utmost possible completeness seemed more important than haste. The Commission, therefore, felt obliged to defer till next Christmas the presentation in final shape of this part of their work, and to content themselves at present with a brief report, accompanied with three appendixes. In the first were contained a part of the data respecting historical manuscripts in private hands which have come to their knowledge through replies received to their circulars of inquiry. The second will comprise a list of all letters of Calhoun hitherto printed. The third will be a classified and indexed list of all the items relating to American history (more precisely, Canadian history and that of the United States and its dependencies) which are to be found scattered through the many volumes of the reports of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts and their appendixes.

Much additional interest accrued to the meetings from the presence in New Haven, at the same time, of the American Economic Association. The members of both bodies were alike invited to the reception held by Professor and Mrs. Henry W. Farnam on Tuesday evening. On Wednesday afternoon the session of the economists was devoted to the economic history of the United States. Four papers were read: by Professor Taussig of Harvard on Some Aspects of the United States Treasury Situation in the Years 1893 to 1897; by Dr. G. S. Callender of Harvard on Early Canal, Railway and Banking Enterprises of the States, in Relation to the Growth of Corporations in the United States; by Professor J. C. Schwab of Yale on Prices and Price Movements in the Confederate States during the Civil War; and by Professor C. S. Walker of the Massachusetts Agricultural College on Recent Economic Changes in the State of Massachusetts. The morning session of the Historical Association was held in union with the New England History Teachers' Association. Professor H. Morse Stephens of Cornell University opened the session with a plea for the study of Scottish and Irish history, instead of the exclusive study, so usual with regard to the early periods, of the history of South Britain. Professor Clyde A. Duniway of Leland Stanford Junior University followed with a brief address on the appropriate methods for the teaching of history to large classes of undergraduates. In informal remarks on this subject, Dr. A. C. Coolidge of Harvard discussed the respective merits of the plan which requires the use of a text-book with supplementary lectures by the teacher, and of that in which the teacher's lectures furnish merely the necessary outline of facts, to be supplemented by reading on the part of the student. He preferred the latter, as accomplishing more toward carrying the student over the transition from the text-book work of the schools to the more advanced methods of the upper classes in college.

At the first formal session, that of Wednesday evening, December 28, after an address of welcome by President Dwight of Yale University, the president of the Association, Professor George P. Fisher, read his inaugural address, a paper marked, as was to have been expected, on the one hand by clearness of thought, keenness and incisiveness, but on the other hand also by moderation and fairness and good temper, and by admirable literary qualities. It has since been printed in the form of a pamphlet. His theme was, The 'Function of the Historian as a Judge of Historic Persons.' Admitting fully the value of the study of society in general, he dwelt upon the interest and importance of the historian's relations to individual personalities, the responsible nature of his duties as a judge, and the frequency with which his office has been abused in past times. Much more can now be learned about historical personages than was formerly possible, and the sense of obligation to be laborious in the search after truth has correspondingly increased. Yet in spite of these advances, we have still to be on our guard constantly against the spirit of hero-worship, against the baser passion for denigration, against the misleading influence of rhetorical fervor, against intolerance of types of character not naturally congenial to the writer, against the love of paradox, against narrow or otherwise faulty ideals of personal worth. Dr. Fisher commented upon the waning influence of party prejudice among writers as one of the most evident signs of improvement in modern historical work. He discussed at some length the question, what shall be the criterion of moral judgment respecting characters in the past. As between those who hold with Lord Acton, that the standard of rectitude to be applied in discussing the characters of the past must be nothing less exigent than the ideal standards of today, and those who would judge men from the point of view of their contemporaries, he contended that, while the most advanced ideal standards must ever be kept in mind, yet in discussing the question of subjective guilt or the degree of personal ill-desert one may rightly take account of the progressive advancement of mankind in moral discernment. He urged the duty of laying chief stress on the principal and vital traits of each human character. In conclusion he dwelt upon the dignity of the historian's calling, as connected with the particular function which had been the theme of his address. The interest of the address was greatly heightened by the many illustrations employed by the reader, illustrations which grace of style and lambent humor never perverted away from justice and from sane conclusions.

After the inaugural address, Professor John M. Vincent of the Johns Hopkins University read an entertaining paper on Municipal Life in the Twelfth Century, his illustrations being chosen from the city of Strassburg. After the conclusion of the evening's exercises the members of the Association were hospitably entertained by a reception on the part of the New Haven Colony Historical Society, in whose ample and dignified building most of the meetings of the Association were held.

The session of Thursday morning was devoted to a conference on fields of history hitherto unduly neglected. Mr. A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard University read a thoughtful and suggestive paper on the Historical Study of the Institutions of the Later Middle Ages. Speaking from the point of view of one whose studies lay in later periods or in the present time, he pointed out first that it is of fundamental importance to be able, discriminating among the various phenomena or tendencies that present themselves in modern times, to seize upon those that are permanent. If the institutions of modern nations are to be criticized chiefly with respect to their adaptation to the characteristics of the nation as formed by the historic past, (for instance, the July Monarchy, so admirable in English eyes, yet rejected as unsuitable by the French), we must pursue more completely the comparative historical study of these permanent tendencies. There are excellent books of English institutional history, and also of French. But as for the comparative study of the history of institutions, it has been pursued mostly with respect to the early periods. For the understanding of modern developments, there is a distinct need of a greater number of comparative studies of the institutions of the later Middle Ages. The services of Gneist, Boutmy and Jenks in this field were meantime acknowledged. It was admitted that the field presented grave difficulties; yet it was urged that the published material was now sufficient to warrant one in entering upon it.

Dr. G. T. Lapsley, by request, remarked upon the institutional development of the border counties of England and Scotland, from the time when, for all that appeared, they might equally well have gravitated toward either kingdom, down through the development of national feeling and the progressive concentration of powers to the time of the formation of the Council of the North. He cautioned against studying the history of these counties as either English or Scottish before they were in fact thus differentiated.

Professor Charles H. Haskins of the University of Wisconsin spoke in cordial support of Mr. Lowell's positions. He dwelt especially upon the importance of the comparative study of English and French institutions. The early Middle Ages had received relatively too much attention. The later Middle Ages were not only nearer to our own time and thus capable of shedding more light upon it; they were also important as being the time when national organizations were being formed. Provincial organizations of that age, too, such as the government of the Dukes of Burgundy, the governments of minor states, the governmental systems of the Papacy, all deserved careful study. Yet it was true that the sources for this period had been much less extensively explored and printed, and much monographic work would have to be done before large generalizations could safely be attempted.

The next paper, by Professor Charles M. Andrews of Bryn Mawr College, dealt with the neglected period of American colonial history which begins with the revolution of 1688 and extends to the Albany Congress of 1754. Historians, most of whom have regarded colonial history from the standpoint of the colonies rather than that of the mother country, have amplified upon the earlier period but slighted this. It falls naturally into two divisions, a time of war and stress, 1688–1713, and a time of peace and of economic and political growth, 1713–1754. Both need much more careful study, if we are to understand the condition of the colonies at the close of the period and their relations to the British imperial administration. Mr. Andrews proceeded to describe and discuss the materials, especially the manuscript materials, essential to such study,—the records of the Board of Trade, the Treasury and Admiralty papers, in the Public Record Office at London; the manuscript collections of the British Museum and the Bodleian Library, and those calendared in the successive reports of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts; the materials in the archives of the states and of outlying provinces like Nova Scotia, and in the cabinets of the historical societies; and the records of ecclesiastical organizations, such as the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

Professor H. L. Osgood of Columbia University expressed himself as very heartily in accord with the views of Professor Andrews. There was much need of a more thorough comparative study of colonial institutions. The old-time state historian, pursuing merely the history of his one colony, and usually the history of events rather than of institutions, had inevitably left the tale half told, more than half unexplained, and had cast little light on the historic forces operating on the colonies as a whole, the general tendencies of the time. Urging the comparative study of single institutions of the colonial period, each being traced in all the colonies, Mr. Osgood laid especial stress upon the need of a fuller study of the royal province, the predominant form of colonial constitution. He spoke of the materials needing to be examined in such studies, and of the insufficient extent to which they had been made accessible in print. He agreed with Professor Andrews that the system of imperial control was very imperfectly known as yet, though it presented many opportunities for the elaboration of helpful monographs.

Speaking upon the general subject of neglected fields, and in the interest of young men to whom topics for monographic treatment are suggested by their elders, Professor J. F. Jameson of Brown University adverted to the danger of assuming that because a subject is greatly in need of satisfactory elucidation, it is therefore a desirable theme to assign to the junior student. Often such a student performs but one extensive piece of original work, his doctoral dissertation. Its topic should by all means be so chosen as to introduce him, in as varied ways as possible, into the knowledge of historical methods. Many topics, which sorely need treatment, are ineligible for this purpose, because the materials for their elaboration lie in sources of but a single sort. If possible, let subjects be chosen which lead into sources of many various kinds. Such are many biographical subjects ; and the speaker especially commended, for the American student, biographies of persons whose careers will lead him into the history of several countries of Europe as well as of America. Such, also, are many topics in the history of religion in America.

An especially agreeable feature of this session was the presence of the Rev. Dr. William Cunningham, of Trinity College, Cambridge, who spoke briefly but interestingly of the condition of historical studies in England. He lamented that they had not a greater hold upon English attention, especially since there was so much still surviving to bring before the Englishman, and perhaps still more the Scotchman, the sense of his relation to the past. He gave several interesting instances, from the city of Edinburgh and the borough of Canongate, of survivals of those institutions of the later Middle Ages which had been discussed earlier in the session. He urged, in consonance with Professor Morse Stephens's remarks, the utility of such study of Scottish history as would enable one to compare, in their curious and instructive resemblances and differences, the institutions which the same race developed on the one and on the other side of the Border.

In the afternoon of the same day the Church History Section held a session unusually well attended. Three papers were read.

The first was an essay on The Beginnings of Protestant Worship, by Professor J. W. Richard, D.D., of Gettysburg, Pa. Dr.

Richard gave a detailed statement of the liturgical changes made in Wittenberg as the result of the reaction against the prevailing doctrinal conceptions. The account emphasized the leadership of Carlstadt, who is often obscured by the concentration of attention on Luther. Carlstadt's initiative determined the form and extent of the innovation by which the Roman mass became a German communion service. Local variations, wherever this example was followed, and Luther's refusal to insist on uniformity of ceremony, made liturgical differences as marked a trait of Lutheran churches as their fixity and uniformity of doctrine.

The paper on Erasmus by the Rev. Dr. George Norcross, of Carlisle, Pa., was not without elements of popular interest, but was primarily intended for another audience.

Professor Samuel Macauley Jackson's account of Zwingli and the Baptist party in Zurich gave prominence to the extremely cautious methods of this most radical of the reformers, and the cruelty and arrogance of his treatment of the Baptists who pressed their conclusions farther and at once brought their individual practice into agreement with their doctrine. The body of the paper dealt with Zwingli's literary polemic against the Baptists. A disputed point was fixed by a letter of Zwingli showing that torture had been applied, more than once, indeed, to Hübmaier. In remarks following the paper, Professor Jackson held that the Baptist party need not be traced to any prior historical movement in the circles of Waldensians or Franciscan tertiaries. The forming impulses came from Zwingli himself. When Scripture was asserted as sole authority and church practice subjected to criticism, every belief and usage was naturally made the subject of fresh revisions.

After the adjournment of this session the members were received by the president, Professor Fisher, at his house.

The session of Thursday evening was devoted to topics in the diplomatic history of America. Professor William M. Sloane of Columbia University read a paper on Napoleon's plans for French colonies in Spanish America. Professor George L. Burr of Cornell University, who conducted for the Venezuela-Guiana Boundary Commission nearly all of its elaborate historical researches, described the methods and the results of his search. Dr. J. M. Callahan of the Johns Hopkins University read a paper on the Diplomatic Relations of the Confederate States and England. The first two of these papers we are so fortunate as to be able to present in the present number of the Review. The last paper of the evening was one by Professor Edwin A. Grosvenor of Amherst College on American Diplomacy, for which he aimed to vindicate an exceptionally high place. He dwelt upon the abilities and successes of our diplomats abroad, from Franklin down, and of our Secretaries of State; and maintained that during the nineteenth century no country has contributed more than the United States to the development of international law. In discussion of his paper Professor S. M. Macvane asserted a marked decline in the quality of our representatives abroad, and a marked diminution of their successes, in the period after 1820.

But one more session was devoted entire to the reading of papers, that of Friday morning, December 30. Colonial history and policy was on this occasion the general topic. Under the title of "A Forgotten Danger to the New England Colonies," Dr. Frank Strong of Yale University related from original sources the story of Cromwell's project for transferring the inhabitants of New England to the West Indies. Professor Henry E. Bourne of the Western Reserve University developed "Some Lessons from the Recent History of European Dependencies." He examined the recent experience of the French, Dutch and English, first with respect to colonial tariffs and commercial regulations, and then with respect to the forms of colonial government and the organization of the colonial civil service. Great interest was aroused by the paper read by Judge Simeon E. Baldwin of the Yale Law School on the Constitutional Questions incident to the Acquisition and Government by the United States of Island Territory. But the paper was one which fell chiefly within the field of constitutional law and political science, and hardly at all within that of history, and the discussions which followed were discussions of constitutional interpretation and of public policy rather than of historical fact. Briefly, Judge Baldwin concluded for the power to acquire such territory, but urged the constitutional difficulties attending its administration, particularly in respect to the provisions of the Constitution relating to uniform tariffs and to trial by jury. Dr. James Schouler opposed the policy of annexation, Professor Hart advocated it.

In the afternoon, at the concluding session, Dr. Herbert Friedenwald, Superintendent of the Manuscripts Department in the Library of Congress, described the collections of historical manuscript possessed by that institution. Now that in the new building they can be brought together, a satisfactory arrangement effected and a catalogue begun, it is seen that there are about twenty-five thousand letters or other papers. Dr. Friedenwald described the steps taken or to be taken toward making them more accessible. They are chiefly of value to the colonial and revolutionary history of the United States, in a less degree to the history of the West Indies and British

America. The leading portions of the collection, as described, seem to be the following: a portion of the papers collected by George Chalmers; the Vernon-Wager papers, chiefly originating with Admiral Lord Vernon; a large collection of the papers of two British commissioners, Colonel Thomas Dundas and Mr. J. Pemberton, whose duty it was, between 1783 and 1790, to conduct minute inquiries into the losses, claims and services of the American Loyalists; the records of the Virginia Company and other early Virginian papers derived from the library of Jefferson; papers collected by Peter Force, relating to New Hampshire and other colonies (but Dr. Friedenwald reports that the continuation of Force's *Archives*, supposed to be possessed in manuscript by the Library of Congress, simply does not exist); a considerable mass of Delaware documents, especially of John Dickinson; the minutes of the Baltimore Committee of Safety, 1774–1776; those of the Council of Safety kept at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, 1774–1777; a series of 214 press-copies of Washington's letters, 1793–1799; the letter-books and many documents of Rochambeau; papers of the Count de Ségur and of Governor Thomas Pownall; papers of Henry R. Schoolcraft, of General John Sullivan, of General Nathanael Greene, of Colonel Ephraim Blaine, of President Monroe, 1804–1806, of Du Simitière and of John Paul Jones. A calendar of the last and of the Washington manuscripts may, it appears, be expected to appear shortly.

It remains to speak briefly of those matters of business, mostly transacted on this last afternoon, which have not been mentioned already. The Council exercised its new function of electing members of the Board of Editors of this REVIEW by choosing Professor A. C. McLaughlin of the University of Michigan. Article IV. of the Constitution of the Association was amended in such manner that henceforth six members of the Executive Council are to be elected by the Association instead of four. The two members immediately added were Professor George B. Adams of Yale and Professor McLaughlin. Mr. James Ford Rhodes of Boston was elected president for the year 1899; the names of the other officers and of the members of the committee will be found upon the next page. Mr. Talcott Williams having resigned from the Historical Manuscripts Commission, his place was filled by the choice of Dr. Herbert Friedenwald. With respect to the place of subsequent meetings, the Executive Council by formal vote pronounced in favor of a definite plan of rotation, in accordance with which the Association will meet one year in some city of the East, the next year in some city of the West, and the third year in Washington, its official home. This vote might naturally have led to the selection of a

Western town for the meeting in Christmas week of 1899; but the inauguration of the scheme was postponed one year, and on December 27, 28 and 29 the Association will meet in Boston and Cambridge. The American Economic Association, on the other hand, will meet in Ithaca.

The *Annual Report* of the Association for 1897 makes its appearance just as this issue of the REVIEW goes to press.

It would be an act of great injustice to close this account of a most interesting and successful convention without recording the fact that its interest and success were due, in greater measure than to anyone else, to the members of the local committee of arrangements, and especially to its chairman, Professor Edward G. Bourne of Yale University.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

President,	James Ford Rhodes, Esq.
First Vice-President,	Edward Eggleston, Esq.
Second Vice President,	Professor Moses Coit Tyler.
Secretary,	Professor Herbert B. Adams.
Assistant Secretary and Curator,	A. Howard Clark, Esq.
Treasurer,	Clarence W. Bowen, Esq.
Secretary of the Church History Section,	Rev. Dr. Samuel M. Jackson.

Executive Council (in addition to the above named officers):

Hon. Andrew D. White,
President Charles Kendall Adams,
Hon. William Wirt Henry,
President James B. Angell,
Henry Adams, Esq.,
Hon. George F. Hoar,
Rev. Dr. Richard S. Storrs,
James Schouler, Esq.,
Professor George P. Fisher,
Professor H. Morse Stephens,
Professor Frederick J. Turner,
Professor Albert Bushnell Hart,
Hon. Melville W. Fuller,
Professor George B. Adams,
Professor A. C. McLaughlin.

Committees (in the order of their origin):

Historical Manuscripts Commission: Professor J. Franklin Jameson, chairman, Professor William P. Trent, Professor Frederick J. Turner, James Bain, Jr., Esq., Herbert Friedenwald, Esq.

Committee on the Study of History in Secondary Schools: Professor A. C. McLaughlin, chairman, Professor H. B. Adams, George L. Fox, Esq., Professor A. B. Hart, Professor C. H. Haskins, Professor Lucy M. Salmon, Professor H. Morse Stephens.

Committee on the Programme of the next Meeting: Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, chairman, Professors H. B. Adams, H. E. Bourne, W. A. Dunning, C. H. Haskins.

Committee on the Winsor Prize: Professor Frederick J. Turner, chairman, Professors C. M. Andrews, E. P. Cheyney, H. L. Osgood, C. L. Wells.

Committee on the History of Colonies and Dependencies: Professor Henry E. Bourne, chairman, Professors Bernard Moses, H. Morse Stephens, F. Wells Williams, G. M. Wrong.

General Committee: Professor H. B. Adams, chairman.

Committee on Bibliography: W. E. Foster, Esq., chairman, Messrs. A. Howard Clark, George Iles, J. N. Larned, R. G. Thwaites.

THE RECANTATIONS OF THE EARLY LOLLARDS

It is a curious fact in the history of national thought that the first considerable group of men who were persecuted in England for matters of religion submitted themselves almost without resistance to ecclesiastical authority. A group of bold, earnest, enthusiastic men in the first flush of an assertion of independent judgment and of the world's need of moral reform nevertheless abjured their beliefs, acknowledged the authority of the Church, and conformed themselves to its behests almost as soon as they were bidden to do so by its accredited officials. After the beginning of the series of prosecutions of this group of heretics in 1377, almost twenty-five years elapsed before the first man was found who carried his resistance to the bitter end. In a word, the whole of the first generation of the Lollards recanted.

Heresy was a new phenomenon in England. The medieval ideal of religious uniformity, of complete homogeneity of faith among all the individuals of the nation, over all the countries of Christendom, and through all the centuries of Christian time, had been existent in England to a remarkable degree. But in the later decades of the fourteenth century it became evident that this long career of unbroken orthodoxy was drawing to a close. Ecclesiastical revolt, radical religious ideas, and even actual heresy were showing themselves in several parts of the country and in various classes of society. The most conspicuous centre of this disaffection was undoubtedly the University of Oxford. Here the influence of Wycliffe became supreme, remained so till his retirement in 1381, and revived soon after that time to remain dominant for many years. In his personal teachings, in his disputations, and in his various literary productions, Wycliffe was taking a position antagonistic not only to many of the practices of the Church, but to much of its philosophy and theology; and he was moreover largely carrying the University with him.[1] Robert Rigge, the chancellor for the year 1382, favored his influence in every way. He appointed Dr. Nicholas Hereford, a prominent adherent of Wycliffe's views, to deliver the chief sermon of the year in the English language, that given on Ascension Day,

---

[1] Bull of Pope Gregory XI., of May 22, 1377; Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana*, Rolls Series, I. 346.

May 15. This was preached in the cemetery of St. Frideswide's, where Christ Church College now stands. It was distinctly directed to the populace, and expressed religious views that received more approval from the citizens of Oxford than from the conservative clergy.[1]

A month later the chancellor appointed, as the preacher of the Latin sermon on Corpus Christi Day, Philip Reppingdon, who had lately taken his doctor's degree, and in his first lecture had declared that in moral matters he intended to defend the doctrines of Wycliffe, and that in regard to the sacrament of the altar he would place a finger before his lips till God should further enlighten the hearts of the clergy. On this very day, which had been specially appointed to honor the doctrine of transubstantiation, Reppingdon declared Wycliffe's opinion of the sacrament to be true, the chancellor afterwards congratulating him upon what he had said.[2] At another time a student named William James, in the presence of all the masters of arts, declared that the Eucharist was mere idolatry; and the chancellor made no comment except to interpose the mild restriction, "if you speak as a philosopher."[3] Of course there were others who took a more conservative stand, but on the whole Oxford seems to have been dominated by the "Lollards," as this English party came to be called from their heretical predecessors on the Continent.

Partly an offshoot of this Oxford agitation was the propaganda of the so-called "poor priests." From as early a date probably as 1377, many preachers unauthorized by the proper church officials, under the constant direction and advice of Wycliffe and other Oxford men, were travelling through the country, "on foot, clothed in long garments of russet, all of one cut, sowing their errors among the people, and preaching them publicly in their sermons."[4] We know, unfortunately, but little about these "poor priests," but occasionally some of the more conspicuous of them leave a fuller record of their sayings and doings. John Aston, a master of arts of Oxford, travelled on foot through the country, refusing to use a horse lest his care and feeding might delay him, thus, as a contemporary opponent amiably describes him, "leaping up from his bed like a dog, ready to bark at the slightest sound."[5] On Palm Sunday he preached at Leicester, denying the power of prelates to excommunicate for other than spiritual offences, declaring that the rules of the monastic orders were attempts to make a more perfect religion than that of Christ and the apostles, and giving what was certainly an unorthodox definition to the doctrine of transubstantiation. But his strongest denunciations were reserved for the wealth, the luxury, the idleness of many of the clergy. He declared that there would never be a good and permanent peace in the realm until all temporal possessions were taken from the clergy, and he called upon his hearers to raise their hands in a vow that each would help as far as he was able in this object. On St. Matthew's day he preached at Gloucester in much the same strain, through here the special burden of his sermon was opposition to the crusade against France which was then being organized by the Bishop of Norwich.[1] This is of course the description of an antagonist, and we may safely credit the unauthorized preachers with more exhortation to devotion and teaching in the humble duties of life, and with somewhat less of polemic and destructive doctrine than appears here. But even so, disseminating, as they did, translations of parts of the Bible into English; preaching in the church-yards, the market-places, and the open roads; developing a more emotional and more popular religious life, they must have formed a distinctly new and disturbing influence, quite apart from the heretical views which they probably held and expressed.

---

[1] *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, Rolls Series, pp. 304–308.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 306.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 307.

[4] *Chronicon Angliae*, Rolls Series, p. 395.

[5] Henry Knighton, *Chronicon*, Rolls Series, II. 176.

Among the nobility and gentry there was much criticism of the existing organization and administration of the Church, and considerable irregularity of belief. John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, the highest noble of the realm, supported Wycliffe and other Lollards on more than one occasion, and consistently antagonized the clergy. Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland and Lord Marshal of England, was also declared to be a "fautor" of the Lollards. Sir John Montague, who subsequently became Earl of Salisbury, when he came into possession of the manor of Shevley removed all the wooden images of the saints which had been gathered in the chapel there by his predecessors and had them laid away in obscurity, excepting a certain figure of St. Catherine, which was such an especial favorite with the servants that he allowed it to be placed in the kitchen. Long afterward, when he met an inglorious and unshriven end at the hands of a mob at Cirencester, in the abortive rising of 1400, the chronicler points out that having been through all his life a derider of the sacraments and a scoffer at images, he himself closed his life without the comfort of the sacrament of confession.[2] At least three influential members of the King's

[1] Knighton, Rolls Series, II. 176.

[2] Walsingham, Rolls Series, II. 244.

council, Sir Lewis Clifford, who fought with John of Gaunt in Spain, in France and in Africa; Sir Richard Stury, an old servant of Edward III., and fellow-ambassador with Chaucer in Italy, and Sir John Clanvowe were known as Lollards. Later, Sir John Cheyne, Speaker of the House of Commons, and Sir Thomas Erpingham, Lord Chancellor, and, later still, Sir John Oldcastle, were adherents of the "new sect." Certain knights had received the soubriquet of *milites capuciati* because they refused to take off their caps or hoods when the host was carried past in the street.[1] Complaint was made by the more conservative that many of the gentry gave protection and support to the wandering preachers, forcing the villagers to attend their sermons, and preventing any action being taken against them.[2]

Not only at the university, among the lay nobles and gentry, and in the rural villages, but among the townsmen there was equal or greater religious unrest. In London a certain Peter Pateshulle, who had made use of a papal appointment to leave the Augustinian order, of which he had been a member, "escaping from the nest of the devil," as he expressed it, began making statements which purported to be disclosures of the enormities committed in the house of that order. He was induced to go to the church of St. Christopher to repeat these in more detailed form. Word was taken to the house of the Augustinians of what Pateshulle was saying, and some twelve of their number proceeded to the church to listen. Finally, one of them was unable to contain himself and rose to deny the charges. Immediately a scuffle ensued, the friars were ejected, the disturbance spread to the street and was only prevented from becoming a serious riot by the efforts of various men of influence in the city.[3] When John Aston, one of the Oxford men, was being tried for heresy at Lambeth, the sympathizing mob actually broke in the doors of the archbishop's room and put a stop to the trial.[4] At another time Lollard placards were fastened on the doors of St. Paul's and handed through the streets. The mayor and aldermen of London, carried along by the puritanic wave, declared that the bishop was neglecting his duty of punishing vice, and that immorality was thriving so that they feared that some judgment would fall upon them and that the city would be swallowed up by an earthquake. They proceeded, therefore, to take the matter into their own hands, arrested all prostitutes, shaved their heads, and had them drawn through the streets on open wagons, preceded by men playing pipes and horns, to attract the more attention to their shame.[1] At Leicester, just outside the city gates and near the old lepers' hospital, was a chapel which served the Lollards regularly as a place for religious gatherings. Here a certain priest named William Swynderby preached to great crowds which gathered from the town and from the surrounding country. When he had been forbidden by the Bishop of Lincoln to preach any more in this or in any other chapel, church, or churchyard in the diocese, he chose a pile of millstones set out for sale by the highway as his pulpit, and defied the bishop to interfere with his preaching, "so long as he possessed the good-will of the people." [2] At Oxford on the occasion of Reppingdon's Corpus Christi Day sermon already mentioned the mayor was present at the invitation of the Chancellor, and had with him a hundred armed men, twenty of whom accompanied the radical party subsequently to the meeting inside the church and thus helped to overawe the orthodox element. It is quite evident that the populace of the town of Oxford was in sympathy with the Lollards in the University. In Reading also and in Northampton tracts were being distributed by the religious agitators.

---

[1] *Chronicon Angliae*, Rolls Series, p. 377.

[2] Knighton, II. 181.

[3] Walsingham, II. 58.

[4] *Ibid.*, II. 65.

Among the lower clergy there was evidently much sympathy with one or another aspect of the prevalent revival. Chaucer's parish priest, one of the few men whose pictures he draws with a loving touch, was called a Lollard because he objected to profanity.

> "'Sir parish prest,' quod he, 'for goddes bones,
> Tel us a tale,' . . . .
> . . . .
> The persone him answerde, '*benedicite*,
> What eyleth the man, so sinfully to swere?'
> Our hoste answerde, 'O Jankin be ye there?
> I smelle a loller in the wind.'" [3]

Thus during the last two decades of the fourteenth century and the first three or four of the fifteenth we hear of Lollards in all directions. The statement of a contemporary chronicler that "scarcely would you see two men on the road but one of them was a disciple of Wycliffe," [4] is certainly a great exaggeration, or true of only very limited localities. Moreover, by no means all of the agitation on religious questions was heresy. Nevertheless there is quite enough evidence to show that as great a wave of religious as of social and political unrest was passing over England; and that in many cases this religious dissent extended to actual heresy.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, II. 65.

[2] Knighton, II. 191, 192.

[3] The Shipman's Prologue, ll. 4-15, Skeat's ed. B. 1170-1176.

[4] Knighton, II. 19?.

At first there was evidently some reluctance to take strong action to meet the rising tide of rebellion against ecclesiastical authority. Perhaps the bishops themselves were favorable to some of its objects. It was the age of the Statutes of Provisors and Praemunire, of the Spiritual Franciscans and of the Great Schism. Archbishop Simon of Sudbury was a moderate man, and the church authorities generally were bitterly reproached by the more strict of the next generation for their laxity. Perhaps the favor given to the movement by persons closely connected with the King may have combined with this moderation to bring about that neglect by which "they sent their sheep out exposed to the jaws of wolves, and no one of them lifted his staff to drive these away."[1]

Half-hearted suits were brought against Wycliffe himself in 1377, 1378 and 1381; but in the spring of 1382, under the influence of the new archbishop, Courtenay, a much more strenuous series of prosecutions was begun. On May 17th of that year a council of church officials and theologians met at the call of the archbishop in the hall of the Dominican friars in London. This body held seven sessions at intervals during May and June, and did much to bring the prevailing discussions and agitations to a culmination. In the first place, a number of statements of doctrine which were said to be habitually made by the Wycliffites in their sermons and disputations were formulated and condemned. The archbishop then proceeded to issue a general mandate reciting these condemned errors and heresies and prohibiting anyone from holding them, teaching them, or having any intercourse with any person who should hold or teach them.[2]

At the second session of the council appeared the chancellor of Oxford, Robert Rigge, and a doctor of theology, Thomas Brightwell. They were examined as to their recent actions in relation to the heretical party at Oxford, and also concerning their own beliefs. As to the latter they professed entire orthodoxy and agreed immediately to the statement of condemnation of the Lollard teachings. Then in penitence for the favor which the chancellor had recently shown to Wycliffe and his friends, Rigge went on his knees before the archbishop and humbly asked pardon. This was granted him through the mediation of the Bishop of Winchester. The chancellor was then ordered to seek out, to suspend, and force to recantation all persons at Oxford still clinging to the views officially condemned. As a result of this action Philip Reppingdon, Nicholas Hereford, John Aston and Lawrence Bedeman were brought before the archbishop and the council. After a certain amount of discussion and postponement Bedeman and Reppingdon made their peace with the archbishop and were restored to their positions at Oxford, the former on the 18th of October, the latter on the 23d. Aston was more recalcitrant, at least for a while, and he was handed over to the secular power for imprisonment. But his resistance only endured for a few weeks, when on the 24th of November he made the following recantation:

---

[1] Walsingham, II. 188.

[2] *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, pp. 272–282.

> "In the name of God Amen. Y John Aston priest unworthy, required of my Lord the erchbyschop of Canturbery the nynetene day of June in the yer of grace a thousand thre hundred fourscore and two, in the hous of the Freres Prechoures at London whan y was required to say what y felyde in the matyr of the sacrament of the autere, y have knowlechyde, and yit I do, that the selfe bred that the priste holdes in his hondes is made, thorou the vertue of the sacramental wordus, verely the self Christus body that was borne of the mayden Marye and taken and suffrede deth on the crosse, and thre days lay in the sepulchre, and the thridde day ros from deth to lyve, and steyede up into heven and syttes on the ryght honde of God, and in the day of dome schal come to deme the quikke and the ded; and over this I beleve generaly alle that holy writ determynet in worde and in understondyng, or what ever holy kyrke of God determynes of alle this.
>
> "Whan J was requirede specyaly to say what I felde of this proposition: Materiale brede leves in the Sacrament after the consecration; J make this protestation that I never thought ne taught ne prechide that proposition. For I wote wele that the mater and the speculation thereof passes in heyghte myn understondying, and therefore als mykele tellys openly for to leve in this mater I beleve, and of this mater or of any other touchyng the ryght beleve of holy kyrke, that is nought expresside in holy writte, I beleve, as oure modur holy kirke beleves, and in this belyve I will dye, and of this thing I beseke alle men and alle wymmen to whom this confession come to bere me witnesse before the hygest juge at the day of dome."[1]

Nicholas Hereford, the remaining Oxford teacher who was under prosecution, fled from England, journeyed to Rome and appealed to the Pope. After a hearing before a convocation of the clergy there, however, he was condemned and committed to prison. Freed from the papal prison by the Roman mob in one of the frequent risings of this period, Hereford returned to England and eluded arrest for a time; but in 1391 he gave up his resistance, obtained royal protection, and was reconciled to the Church.[2]

Thus the whole group of Oxford contemporaries of Wycliffe, so far as they had become prominent enough to attract attention, recanted. Wycliffe's own retirement to the obscurity of Lutterworth seems, notwithstanding his continued literary activity, to have placated sufficiently the conservative forces of his own time.

---

[1] Knighton, II. 171–172.

[2] Forshall and Madden, Introduction to the *Wycliffite Versions of the Bible*, Vol. I., p. xvii.

In the various other places where heresy was growing up we find the same readiness to recant when pressure was brought to bear. William Swynderby, who had gathered the crowds of Leicester and its vicinity to listen to his preaching from the millstones in the King's highway, was summoned by John Buckingham, Bishop of Lincoln, to appear before him on a certain day in the cathedral at Lincoln. Here he was convicted of teaching various errors and heresies and remanded to the bishop's prison. The Duke of Lancaster happened to be there at the time, and the friends of Swynderby appealed to him to use his influence with the bishop to obtain for the heretical preacher an easy form of retractation or a mild punishment. His recantation was, however, humiliating enough. He seems to have made no resistance to the bishop's requirement, which was that he should declare on oath that all those things which he had taught and which were now objected to had been false, that he should swear never to preach such things again, and that he should promise not to speak publicly again under any conditions within the diocese of Lincoln, without the special permission of the bishop. Moreover, he was required to take the same oath openly and audibly after service on each of the succeeding Sundays, in three parish churches in Leicester, and in the churches of Melton Mowbray, Halyton, Hareborough and Lowtborough; so that all the people who had before listened to his bold preaching should now hear his recantation.[1]

William Smith, a friend and fellow-worker with Swynderby, was forced by the Archbishop of Canterbury to recant at Leicester, in 1392, and by way of penance was required to walk around the market-place, clothed only in his shirt, carrying a crucifix in his right hand and an image of St. Catherine in his left. The archbishop also compelled him to surrender his translation of the Bible into English, and other works which he had been engaged in writing for the previous eight years. Roger Dexter and his wife were at the same time required to walk around the public square in shirts and carrying crosses.[2]

In the same year, 1392, when the King was holding a great council at Stamford, the ecclesiastical members and a number of other churchmen were gathered into a convocation in the church of the Carmelites of that city to examine a certain Henry Crumpe. He was an Irishman, a doctor of theology, a member of the Cistercian order. He had ranked as a conservative in the times of Wycliffe at Oxford, but had subsequently preached heresy in Ireland and was now teaching questionable opinions at Oxford. He made some defense of his views, but finally, on the 30th of May, in the presence of the archbishop and a large number of ecclesiastics and laymen, at the church of St. Mary, abjured all irregular teachings. He was forbidden to teach or to preach further without the special license of the archbishop.[1]

---

[1] Knighton, II. 189–198.

[2] Knighton, II. 312.

John Purvey, an intimate personal friend of Wycliffe and joint translator with him of the Bible, after almost twenty years of preaching and writing was imprisoned in the archbishop's prison at Saltwood, and then brought before a council of the province of Canterbury at St. Paul's in London, on the 29th of February, 1400. Here he made, in Latin, a most abject recantation, which he was compelled to repeat in English at St. Paul's Cross, Sunday March 6. A part of his abjuration before Convocation is in the following terms:

"In which matters I have humbly submitted myself and do at present submit myself to the correction, judgment, and instruction of the reverend father and lord Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, with his council, acknowledging the truth of the Catholic faith and my former errors and heresies; and standing here in person, not induced by violence or fear, but purely, spontaneously and freely, I curse and abjure forever all my heresy, and especially that with which I have been recently charged."[2] At the same time John Becket of London and John Seynon of Darton, both laymen, made public recantation of their Lollard opinions.

It is impracticable to follow out every instance of persecution for heresy during these last two decades of the fourteenth century, but in all cases we find the same result: whenever any considerable degree of pressure on the part of the authorities is brought to bear, recantation follows. It was not until 1401 that a poor chaplain of Leicester, William Sawtre, after one recantation refused again to belie his opinions, withstood a long and harassing trial, and was finally burned at Smithfield. It was nine years more before the first instance was found of a man who never recanted, but clung to his beliefs faithfully all the way to the stake.

This brings us again to our first question. Why did the early Lollards all recant? The general giving up of religious beliefs under persecution has not been a familiar historical occurrence. Readiness to desert personal religious convictions has not been generally characteristic of human nature. On the contrary it has been a very common phenomenon for men to exhibit a devotion to their peculiarities of religious belief quite sufficient to withstand the bitterest persecution and the most repulsive forms of death. The very successors of these same heretics, the Lollards of the next generation, from about 1415 to 1450, showed themselves a peculiarly stiff-necked people and furnished a roll of martyrs quite worthy to compare with those of the next century. Under Henry VIII., under Mary and under Elizabeth, there was but little shrinking from the consequences of faithfulness to religious beliefs whether Catholic or Protestant. Hundreds of men and women then, as thousands before and since, went to the stake readily enough, when a simple recantation would have saved them. Men have been on the whole much more ready to die for their religious principles than to desert them. It therefore remains all the more a curious question why all the early Lollards who were persecuted recanted.

---

[1] *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, pp. 343–359.

[2] *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 400.

Some elements of the solution of the problem lie ready to hand. An appreciable number of those subjected to prosecution probably looked upon the whole discussion as a matter of academic interest only. They considered the dispute as to the nature of the Eucharist as a question of dialectics. This was especially true of the Oxford men. Much of the intellectual life of the universities of the time consisted in the drawing of fine distinctions, in making ingenious interpretations of the words of the church fathers and the philosophers, in the infinitely continued formulation and recapitulation of definitions and arguments and inferences. Wycliffe himself was first of all a schoolman, a disputant. For instance, in defending his thesis that the bread after the ceremony of consecration was not transformed in its substance, but only in its significance, he declared that it was similar to the case where Gregory or Innocent is converted into a pope, but remains the same man as before, or where a sinner is transformed into a good man, or where wood is converted into an image, or water into ice, but all remain essentially the same as before. Or again, combatting the doctrine that the bread ceases to be bread in substance, though it retains evidently its accidents of whiteness, roundness, taste, solidity and such qualities, he said that in that case the consecrated bread was infinitely lower in its nature than horse-bread, or rat's bread, or even than a rat's dung, for all of these at least have substance, while the sacramental bread is said no longer to have its substance; but as all substance is infinitely more perfect than any mere attribute, the syllogism is complete and the sacramental bread is the inferior.[1]

Wycliffe, it is true, in addition to the disputant, was a great reformer, an earnest, intensely religious man. Many other men appreciated and participated in the former part of his interest, but did not share in the latter. For them it was one thing to hold and defend these radical opinions for dialectical uses, for the excitement of academic debate; it was quite another to stand by the same beliefs when ordered to abjure them by the constituted authorities. Probably several of the most prominent of the early Lollards recanted because their views were only academic, not really serious or earnest, or in any proper sense religious.

---

[1] *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, pp. 108–109.

A second class of those whose heretical beliefs did not lie very deep might be described as those who were led into them largely by their political interests. In the scheming and intrigue for political influence which in the latter years of Edward III. and during the reign of Richard II. took the place of the more worthy party divisions of other and better periods, one of the most constant threads of policy was a certain antagonism to the clergy. Many men of ambition and activity in political life found it to their interest to oppose the prelates who were at that time doing so large a part of the work of government. Opposition to the clergy ran easily into opposition to the organized church. Participation with the more earnest Lollards in their criticism of the existing church system could hardly be distinguished from sharing with them their divergencies of doctrine. It is probable that many of those who earned the condemnation of the orthodox element really shared but slightly in the most earnest parts of the religious excitement in the country. And it is only natural that such men should readily desert their party when suspicion of holding heretical views became a serious detriment to their political success. John of Gaunt gave no support to the Lollards after the Peasants' Rebellion of 1381. In 1395, when King Richard was carrying on a campaign in Ireland, two of the bishops came over to him to complain of the activity of the Lollards and to charge their boldness to the support they received from some of the members of the King's council. Richard, stricken with one of his sudden fits of anger, hastened to London. The scene with the accused councillors is better told in the words of a chronicler who was living at the time than it can be in any more modern English.

> "The kyng whan he had conceyved the malice of these men, he cleped hem to his presens, and snybbed hem; forbad hem eke thei schuld no more meynten no swech maters. Of Richard Story he took a hooth, for he swore on a book that he schuld nevyr meynten no swech opiniones. And after this hooth the king saide—'And I swere here onto the, if evyr thou breke thin ooth, thou shal deye a foul deth.' They that were gilty in this mater withdrow gretly her oteRauns of malys." [1]

---

[1] Capgrave's *Chronicle of England*, Rolls Series, p. 260.

Sir Lewis Clifford, another old-time supporter of the Lollards, signalized his desertion of them in 1402 by communicating to the Archbishop of Canterbury a series of statements of doctrines which they had put forth and the names of those who were responsible for these doctrines.[1]

Still a third class might be distinguished as men of extreme, unbalanced, or visionary temperament, who might fairly be expected to adopt readily any unusual opinions, but who would be likely to give them up with equal readiness, or from equally insufficient motives. For instance, a certain knight in Wiltshire, named Lawrence de St. Martin, asked for the communion on Easter even; but when the priest handed him the consecrated wafer, instead of putting it into his mouth he took it in his hands, rose from his knees, and carried it home, fastening the door, dividing the bread into three pieces and eating one with oysters, one with onions and one with wine. He then announced that it seemed very much like any other bread, such as he had in his house already. Meanwhile the priest had followed, imploring him not to commit so great sacrilege, and the servants of his house drew back in astonishment and terror. One can hardly conceive of a piece of more ill-placed levity and of more reckless impiety, according to all medieval standards, and one is therefore hardly surprised to find St. Martin succumbing immediately when, a few days afterward, he was summoned before the Bishop of Salisbury and ordered to submit himself to the advice of a number of clergymen who were sent to visit him. Very soon he announced his conversion to orthodox views, asked the bishop's pardon, and declared himself willing to undergo any penance that should be imposed upon him. The bishop ordered him to erect a stone cross at Salisbury on which should be carved the whole story of his enormity, and required him to appear there repeatedly on holidays, with uncovered head, barefoot, and clad only in his undergarments, to make a public statement of his penitence and disavowal of his previous impious views.[2]

Again, there was a certain old gentleman (*venerabilis miles*, the chronicler calls him), of London, named Sir Cornelius Clowne. He had been a believer in Lollard doctrines, but was much impressed by the solemnities of a certain religious procession which passed through the streets of London in recognition of the decision of the council of 1382. The day after the procession he attended the celebration of the mass by a young priest in the chapel of the Dominicans. As the celebrant broke the bread the knight saw with wonder that, instead of its previous aspect, it had all the appearance of veritable flesh, raw and dripping with blood. Moreover, as the third particle of the bread, as is usual, was about to be dropped into the cup of wine, Clowne saw plainly the letters of the word "Jesus," bloody and flesh-like in the whiteness of the piece of bread. He was immediately convinced of the truth of transubstantiation, and himself the next day, after the sermon, narrated his vision publicly and announced himself as intending to live and die in the belief that in the sacrament of the altar there is the true body of Christ, and not merely material bread.[1]

---

[1] Walsingham, II. 253.

[2] Walsingham, I. 450–451.

The fourteenth century seems to have been especially marked by a certain lack of mental balance and calmness. The constructive work of the great medieval, philosophical, theological and legal writers had been completed in the thirteenth century; the fifteenth century was to be provided with new intellectual material and interests through the Renaissance; but lying between these two was a period of intellectual restlessness, criticism, aimlessness that lent itself especially easily to all sorts of aberration. The "Vision" of William of Hampole, as that of another William, "concerning Piers the Plowman," alike give evidence that England was not without a tendency corresponding to that mysticism which was so prevalent on the Continent.

But after all the problem of the recantations is not yet solved. If those men are eliminated whose ready abjuration is explained by their merely disputatious interest, or their political schemes, or their unbalanced minds, there still remain others who are not to be so accounted for. There were men who were earnest, sincere, moderate; and yet these also recanted when put under pressure. Men who had given years of devotion to the cause deserted the cause when they were placed in a critical position. Men recanted who had given every evidence of capacity for self-sacrifice and every indication of moral courage. A reason must be found which will include such men as well as those classes previously described.

The explanation will probably be found not in characteristics of human nature, but in characteristics of the time to which the phenomena belong. In fact this is the solution suggested, the irresistible pressure of the age to bring about uniformity, the incapacity of the single individual to place himself permanently in opposition to the mass of the community.

It is true that the fact of these men submitting only when authority was asserted shows that the immediate cause for their abjuration lay within the realm of fear; but it was not so much the fear of material punishment, nor of ecclesiastical condemnation, nor even of spiritual danger, as it was the fear of isolation, the dread of separation from their kind. They lost their courage, but it was under the stress of an overwhelming recognition that by their divergent beliefs they were separating themselves from the vast mass of Christian mankind. Each felt himself to be one man against all the authority, all the learning, all the organized order and agreement of Christendom past and present. Above all, each man must have endured an internal conflict, his reason warring against his own gregarious instinct, against that corporate spirit of the time in which he himself so completely shared.

---

[1] Knighton, II. 163–164.

It is somewhat difficult for us in our own individualistic modern times to realize the strength of such a feeling to a man in the fourteenth century. The whole character of the Middle Ages tended to subordinate a man to the organization of which he was a member. If a man earned his living by the cultivation of the soil, as did probably four-fifths of the population, he was a member of a village community whose farming and other industrial operations were interwoven and combined almost inseparably. Intermingled holdings, common pastures, co-operative performance of service, made a man almost as dependent on his neighbors as on hinself. The political life of the group of villagers was a congeries of mutual dependencies and common responsibilities. Their religious life gathered them all in the same parish church. Bound together into a single body by economic, legal and social ties, the unit of rural society was not so much the individual man as it was the village or manorial group. A townsman was primarily a constituent part of some merchant or craft gild within the bounds of which were included his whole life and career, its material necessities, its possibilities of ambition, its social and intellectual enjoyments. It was his gild that obtained for him his opportunities and privileges in trade, that kept up the shrine about which his religious life centered, that organized the mistery plays in which he participated, that administered the charitable funds that might give succor to him in his misfortune or relief to his widow and orphans. It was his gild that would unite priest and brethren in masses for his soul after his death. Such a man was not so much an isolated individual as a part of a certain organized body, that is to say his craft, trade, or at the broadest his civic fraternity.

Similarly, if medieval society is looked upon in its feudal aspect it consists, at least in its upper strata, of a group of persons all closely bound together by reciprocal services and duties. The "religious" man or woman was a unit in some monastic order, from whose property he drew his sustenance, to whose rules he conformed his life, whose constituted authorities he obeyed. Thus through all society in the Middle Ages ran this corporate feeling, this instinct of union and close combination with other men. The man who was not united with other men in a somewhat similar position would have felt himself, as in most cases he would really have been, miserable indeed. Moreover the medieval type of mind was thoroughly satisfied with such a subordination and inclusion of the individual in the larger body. The individualism in which the modern man rejoices, or perhaps until recently has rejoiced, his willingness to be the free lance in industry, in travel, in enjoyment, in thought, in religion, was a characteristic or a product of the period of the Renaissance and of the Reformation. The Middle Ages knew little or nothing of it. The recognition that he is one against the world is an exhilarating thought to a modern man; to the medieval man it would have meant utter misery.

Thus when a man realized that he was, in the most omnipresent of all medieval relations, that of religion, actually alone, separated from his fellow-men, excluded from the society to which he naturally belonged, under all but universal condemnation as a traitor to Christendom, one cannot wonder that a sudden fear, a loss of all courage and strength of resistance might have seized upon him, and an entire resignation to the authority of the universal church have followed. An almost pathetic instance of this occurred in 1387. A certain priest, of Lollard views, serving in the household of Sir John Montague, having become ill and feeling that he was upon his death-bed, asked that a priest should be summoned to whom he could confess and from whom he should receive extreme unction. Some servants of the family reminded him that he had often taught them that all confession to another is unnecessary; that if a man confessed to God it was quite enough. He only answered to say that he had sinned, but now wanted a priest. Then Dr. Nicholas Hereford, the great Oxford Lollard, who happened to be present in the house at the time, was summoned to his bedside and urged him to cling to his old beliefs. But the dying man only reiterated his request, declaring in his agony that he only wished to die as a Catholic, and that the sin of his departure unshriven would rest with those who were now denying him the opportunity of confession. And the poor wretch finally died in the midst of his longing for the customary last rites of his Church. It is not hard, probably, even for us, to feel how in the gathering mists of death all disputes, novelties and intricacies of doctrine lost their clearness and force, and only a great longing remained to die as his forefathers had died, as other Christians were dying, to die, as he said, *catholice*.[1]

The effect of a trial before the church authorities and a great gathering of the orthodox clergy and laity was measurably the same. When an Aston, a Purvey, a Swynderby had to face the archbishop and a whole group of bishops and other churchmen; when it was so evident that these prelates represented the Church as a whole; when it was felt that the Church was synonymous with the whole community of Christian believers dead and living; not only all these outward powers but his own instincts pleaded with him for concession, for retractation of all that separated him from the Church; in a word for recantation.

The great force therefore which broke down the religious independence of the early Lollards, which induced them to desert the heretical beliefs which they had adopted, was the collective spirit of the age, a spirit which they themselves fully shared. It was an instinctive tendency to allow the individual to be dominated by society as a whole. Not until the thought of resistance to the Church had become much more familiar, till there were many more sympathizers with such resistance, and above all until a fundamental change in the whole structure of society had encouraged the development of more individualism, were many men found who would or could withstand to the end the pressure of organized ecclesiastical authority.

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY.

---

[1] Walsingham, II. 159–160.

NAPOLEON'S PLANS FOR A COLONIAL SYSTEM[1]

THE close of the Seven Years' War saw Great Britain in the ascendant wherever, throughout the globe, she had come into hostile contact with France. But the balance of 1756 was somewhat redressed in favor of the French by the success of our Revolution. During the years from 1783 to 1792 French history was concerned almost entirely with financial matters, and when the cost had been reckoned of the slender prestige gained in the American war, a contest in which, as both British and French firmly believed, the death-blow had been given to the world-empire of Great Britain, it was found that not the least of impending disasters for France was that of another world-wide war and empty pockets. Between 1792 and 1815 one coalition after another was hurled upon France and her life was one of shocks and spasms. Through these she passed staggering and often hysterical, occupied in the main by the thought of self-preservation but yet concerned from the beginning and at intervals thereafter with a sense of obligation to restore and consolidate a colonial empire.

Accordingly the Revolution had scarcely begun its career when the French India Company was abolished and all its offices incorporated with those of the government. When war was declared in 1793 Brissot announced as part of his programme the annihilation of British power in the East. The Treaty of Versailles had not only restored to France her five Indian dependencies, it had given her a finer and more compact territory in that peninsula than she had before controlled. With anything like unity of plan and harmony of action, she might hope to array under her banners native populations sufficiently numerous and strong to embarrass if not to rout the British power, engaged as it was, to the north, in a life and death struggle with the Mahrattas and with Scinde, the main support of which latter state was the famous Savoyard adventurer,

---

[1] J. Tessier in *Revue Historique*, XV. 349–381; H. Adams, *ibid.*, XXIV. 92–130. Sassenay, *Napoléon Ier et la Fondation de la République Argentine*. In this volume the reader will find an account of the sources and a bibliography, together with some unpublished documents. Extended examination of other unpublished papers, both letters written by Napoleon himself and the diplomatic correspondence of his time, has yielded a scanty harvest, but it affords a reasonable assurance that what is of value relating to Napoleon's colonial schemes is here given in outline.—This paper was read before the American Historical Association at its recent meeting at New Haven.

Benoît de Boigne. Hyder Ali and Tippoo Sahib were antagonists equally redoubtable in the peninsula proper. Their conduct was largely controlled by French revolutionary influences. Seringapatam was the seat of a powerful and active Jacobin club, the leading spirit of which was one Ripaud, a swaggering adventurer claiming to represent the French revolutionary government. By 1790 the revolutionary movement was dominant in Pondicherry and popular representative institutions were established. The well-tried leaders were promptly deposed, jarring and factional politics were rife among not only the settlers but the natives, and when the English general Floyd appeared in 1793, the town fell without having made any adequate resistance. When Wellesley, afterward Lord Wellington, captured Seringapatam in 1799, just about the time when Bonaparte was invading Syria and the Russians were crossing into northern Italy, the Indian victory of the British was everywhere regarded as a staggering blow at Revolutionary France. It is estimated that, counting all the troops organized and fighting as regulars under French officers in India, there were collectively in the respective services of the Begum (Sombre), of Tippoo, of the Nizam, of the Scindia and of the Holkar, not fewer than 60,000, and that perhaps 150,000 Hindus were more or less under the spell of their example and possibly available in a crisis. Of these men, not merely were the Asiatic masters hopelessly divided but the European leaders were likewise enemies one of the other, being some Jacobin, some extreme royalist reactionaries. They quarrelled, and instead of uniting in a great French movement, degenerated into mercenaries with little or no influence. This was partially due to the diplomacy of the British, which in every tactical move managed to deal some stroke which further weakened or disunited the French adventurers.

The failure of Bonaparte's Egyptian expedition would presumably have ended French pretensions in the East; the more so because a British Indian expedition, composed in part of a few European regiments, but mainly of 6000 sepoys, actually assumed the aggressive, embarked at Bombay and landed in May 1801 at Kosseir in the teeth of the French fortress constructed there by Belliard, descended the Nile and early in August formed a junction at Cairo with a British force from England. Yet in spite of this startling phenomenon, viz.: the revelation of a power in British India not content with maintaining itself, but strong enough for offensive aggression, the First Consul lent a willing ear to the projects of the Czar Paul for a joint land expedition against India. Nay, more, he carefully studied them. Both his criticisms and the rejoinders of Paul are in existence. Each "of the two most powerful nations of the world" was to furnish 35,000 men. The forces were to meet at Astrakhan, whence, under the leadership of Masséna, they were to advance toward the Indus. The journey, it was thought, would be little more than a pleasure excursion, for with a free hand presents would be showered on all the petty chiefs and sovereigns encountered by the way; learned men would explain in the various vernaculars that the sole object of the march was to expel the British from India; specialists in all branches of natural science should observe the strange new flora, fauna and climates with a lavish equipment of instruments of precision, from among which balloons were not excluded. Thus the lines of commerce would be open to Russian and French enterprise, while simultaneously a deadly foe would be mortally wounded in his vital extremities. Paul's advance guard actually crossed the Volga on the ice in March, 1801; but his untimely death (he was murdered on March 23) put an end to the "Grand Project," as the originator designated it.

Still Bonaparte was undismayed, and at the close of the same year, before the peace of Amiens was signed, he had selected an agent to represent French interests in India. His choice fell upon General Decaen, a man who had fought gallantly at Hohenlinden and who was considered to have in him the making of a second Dupleix. A plan was discussed, studied and matured, whereby on June 18, 1802, Decaen was appointed "Captain-General of the French Establishment in the Indies." But there was a long standing quarrel between Decaen and Decrès, minister of the navy. More or less friction arose even under the watchful eye of the Chief-Magistrate, who would tolerate no open rupture. It was therefore not until March 5, 1803, that the little expedition was actually ready, and sailed. Decaen's instructions were to avoid rousing any anxiety in the minds of the Anglo-Indian leaders and carefully to conceal the views of his government. If any new proof were needed of the scarcely concealed contempt in which Bonaparte held the peace of Amiens it could be found not only in the selection for such an office of a man like General Decaen, an avowed fire-eating Anglophobe who had repeatedly and urgently requested a mission to India, only that he might fight the English, but also in the text of the instructions given to the general, a paper written nine months after the peace of Amiens was signed, but cogitated and studied even before that short truce was negotiated. Decaen was to put himself in communication with whatever Indian peoples wore the English yoke with the least patience; six months after his arrival he was to set forth in a memoir his views as to maintaining himself in the peninsula, should war break out; lastly he was carefully to examine the problem of how and whither he could retreat in case France should not secure the mastery of the seas. The composition of his expeditionary force was even more significant. There were 1250 men, half French troops, half negro soldiers who had fought in Guadeloupe. But there were no less than seven generals and a corresponding number of lower-grade officers. It was clear to every English observer that a powerful native army was to be formed under French superiors. On the outward journey Decaen carefully reconnoitered the Cape of Good Hope, but found to his disillusionment that though again in Dutch hands there was a powerful body of public opinion much more favorable to Great Britain than to Holland. The numerous British troops stationed there during British occupation had not merely been acclimatized to good purpose for use in India, but had powerfully influenced the imaginations of the settlers and had directed their attention to the value of British connections. It was clear that when the truce was broken the colony would immediately revert to Great Britain unless measures were at once taken to fortify it against British seizure, and this he urged in his dispatches.

When finally on July 11, 1803, Decaen's ship reached Pondicherry he found to his dismay that the British flag had not been lowered, and further that one of his consorts which, not having called at the Cape, had already arrived, was anchored between two British men-of-war. Negotiations with a view to landing the French and the cession of the five settlements had already been commenced; they were continued with such pressure as Decaen could bring to bear and lasted until September, when the news of the rupture of the Treaty of Amiens was officially communicated by the British authorities to the French, with the statement that the expedition must be considered as prisoners of war. This, of course, applied only to the portion still at Pondicherry with Benoît, for under advices from Paris Decaen with the larger part had slipped away to establish himself as commander of the naval station in the Islands of France and Réunion. There, for eight long years, he harassed English commerce as best he might with swift and implacable corsairs. And what man could do by emissaries, bribes, and every known means of secret diplomacy to keep alive French feeling in India, he did with fiery zeal. His mission belongs like the others which we are cataloguing to the list of Napoleon's futile enterprises.

But the real compensation for French losses in the Orient was to be found, as Bonaparte fondly hoped, in the new world. There are two opinions as to what the scheme of the First Consul really was: Thiers thinks that he had centred his hopes in Louisiana, but most historians believe he had reverted to the traditional French policy and had not abandoned the thought of San Domingo, as central to a vast French colonial system in the West. It was as early as 1795 that the French Republic forced on Spain the reluctant cession of her portion of that island. On the prospect of temporary peace, in August, 1800, two months before the preliminary negotiations were opened, Berthier was sent to Madrid to secure the cession of Louisiana; for the next three years Napoleon pursued with tenacity a policy which sought by every possible means to make San Domingo, Guadeloupe and Martinique independent for their necessities of all other sources of supply than Louisiana. He hoped to knit into a firm commercial, social, and political union the French possessions of the Antilles and the main land, cutting out the United States altogether or at least as far as possible from the rich commerce which they carried on with the islands. The strength of this plan in time of peace is perfectly evident; its weakness in time of war, when the sea power of Great Britain would again be in the ascendant, is likewise clear. It is the latter consideration which leads those who can see no spot on the sun of Napoleon's greatness to conclude that his main object was the firm establishment of Louisiana as a centre of French power.

By October 7, 1801, on the very heels of the ratification of the peace preliminaries, the expedition to suppress Toussaint Louverture and inaugurate the new colonial policy was ready. The scheme, even as far as known to the public, was regarded as of the first importance. If successful, negro supremacy would be ended, the institution of slavery restored and the patriarchal system of white planters everywhere re-established. In so far as popular or quasi-popular government under negro leadership had been identified in the western world with French republicanism, its suppression at the hands of the French republican soldiers who formed the core of the expedition, under the leadership of the First Consul's brother-in-law at that, would be a terrific blow at the radical side of the Revolution. On the basis of this fact Talleyrand, at the First Consul's dictation, appealed secretly on November 13, to the court of St. James for its consideration, while in his exposé of the public affairs (November 22) and to Toussaint himself Bonaparte evasively and by suggestion held out the hope of complete liberty for all his subject colonial populations. This double-dealing cannot be too strongly stigmatized, but the effort was virtually approved by the other great powers, who knew the truth and perhaps thought that the restoration of the aristocratic system in the French colonies would react on France herself. It may be remarked in passing that no portions of the St. Helena reminiscences of Napoleon are more misleading than those in which this great colonial enterprise is discussed. Its failure is attributed to Leclerc's disregard of instructions in identifying himself with the white creoles while dealing too liberally with the black and mulatto leaders and too harshly with the negro masses; in particular the great memorialist appeals for the justification of his own plan to a decree of 1801 assuring liberty to the negroes of San Domingo, Guadeloupe and Martinique; there is no such decree and that of like date a year later in 1802, to which manifestly he intended to refer, re-establishes slavery in Guadeloupe! Decrès, writing under Bonaparte's instructions to Richepanse, the French agent in Guadeloupe, on July 16, 1802, eighteen months after the date of Leclerc's instructions, enjoins his correspondent to let the "yoke of wholesome prejudice" under which the blacks have been kept in subordination, continue to weigh heavily upon them. To prevent effectually any extension or perpetuation of native organization in behalf of liberty or even independence, the black and mulatto leaders were to be deported. In short, Bonaparte believed with others that slavery was the one corner-stone upon which his colonial system could rest; all his talk at the time about freedom was a pretext to blind the French radicals at home, and his attempted exculpation of himself at St. Helena was nicely calculated with a view to win the English Whigs.

While the First Consul clearly understood how indispensable American friendship was in the development of his enterprise and had negotiated the convention of September 30, 1800, in order to remove all friction with the United States, yet he was aware that the commercial relations between them and the Antilles must be severed. Leclerc complained bitterly (Leclerc to Decrès, February 9, 1802) that rebellion was fomented and supplies furnished to the rebels by the Americans. The latter, he declared, hoped for nothing short of independence for the Antilles in order that they might monopolize the rich trade.

So loud were the complaints of Leclerc that they embarrassed the French agents elsewhere, and Pichon the *chargé d'affaires* at Washington reproved him. The pathetic tale of Toussaint Louverture, the negro leader in San Domingo—of his betrayal into the hands of his enemies and his death in exile, is an episode of French history utterly disgraceful to the actors in it. The martyr was terribly avenged. Overwhelmed by defeat and calamity Leclerc died on November 2, 1802, a victim of the yellow fever, and Rochambeau, as his successor, had a career of mismanagement and cruelty followed by almost unexampled disaster. But in the interim Bonaparte builded zealously on his colonial structure. On October 15, 1802, the King of Spain under strong pressure signed the cession of Louisiana; on November 26 the First Consul approved the secret instructions to Victor, who was to be captain-general of Louisiana, an acquisition, it was now explained, which was destined to render the Antilles independent of the United States; and on the day following he offered to the King of Spain an exchange:—Parma in return for the coast of the Gulf of Mexico, all the way around from the river St. Mary's on the Atlantic to the Bravo del Norte, the boundary of Mexico. This would consolidate his great self-contained and self-sustaining colonial system by effectually and permanently excluding the United States from the Gulf. Nay more, the Spanish colonies would be the subordinate complement of the French, and from both not only American but English influences would be absolutely cut off. Such was Bonaparte's magnificent plan for the expansion of his world-empire. It must not be forgotten that Louisiana as he received it from Spain was what Spain had received from France; it was not confined in its pretensions to the basin of the Mississippi in its widest extent, but claimed Texas with the Gulf coast and an extension to the Pacific on the far northwest. There is still in existence an outline description containing these pretensions. It is in the French Foreign Office in a corrected draft and, though unsigned, appears to have been the work of Marbois.

The first check to this grand colonial plan came on December 19, when the receipt of alarming news from San Domingo compelled the expedition thither of part of those troops which had been intended for Victor and Louisiana. The loss was unimportant in one sense, because even the two thousand men reserved for Victor were intended rather to adorn the captain-general's dignity than as a means of forcible offense. This is clear because Laussat, the envoy sent to take possession, went alone; there could be no resistance on the return of a French possession to French administration.

Very specious arguments to prove that the rupture of the peace of Amiens was not the work of Napoleon might be based upon the fact that for the successful development of this vast scheme peace was essential, and that he confessed it to be so in a dispatch to London intended for the British government, and dated November 13, 1801. But the question of overt responsibility for the renewal of European war is too complex for such a simple solution. Without a moment's rest throughout the interval of peace the Consul and Emperor incorporated successively Poland, Piedmont, Switzerland, Parma and minor domains like Elba into his European system.

England would give up neither Malta nor, as we have seen, the five settlements of India. The United States began to display uneasiness over the occupation of Louisiana. The San Domingo expedition was manifestly to be a failure or at best a far too costly success: thirty thousand men was an awful sacrifice to make in a single year. It grew more and more manifest that with the increasing irritation and menacing armaments of Great Britain success in two hemispheres was impossible and that the better chance lay nearer home in the eastern.

There is no evidence whatever that Napoleon thought lightly or flippantly of colonial expansion. If the greatest of all the expeditions in which he was engaged, that to Egypt, be regarded rather as a blow at Great Britain than as primarily a colonial enterprise, and this is the fact, yet even in connection with the military arrangements of an offensive movement there were elaborate preparations for settlement and administration. The expedition of Decaen though likewise a side-stroke at England was primarily intended to restore the glories of French rule in India. The second treaty of San Ildefonso, it must also be remembered, enlarged the borders of French Guiana at the expense of Spanish America. As to the Louisiana enterprise, on the contrary, it cannot be asserted that except in the most indirect way there was any thought of hampering Great Britain. Yet the published correspondence of Napoleon teems with evidence of the care and forethought with which preparations for permanent settlement were made. The expenditure of money and energy was enormous, and it was to those bound to him by marriage that he entrusted the Herculean task. Lanfrey's view that the whole scheme was merely a method of sending troublesome republicans to die in exile, borders on the absurd. Republican soldiers were chosen because they were the veterans. As to the voluminous correspondence of Napoleon not included in the great collection, all of which I have examined, there is a just proportion of attention to colonial affairs both on the military and administrative side. Even in the hour of his deep humiliation and when the edifice of his empire was crumbling he had agents working and suffering for the colonial expansion of France. We must, therefore, utterly reject the notion that Napoleon lightly abandoned the idea of French hegemony in Latin America. In fact this policy was considered by Napoleon III. to be a clause in his uncle's political will. When the time came the great Napoleon made his choice, to be sure, with no sign of the agony which he must have felt in abandoning his American schemes. But this was characteristic. He could endure no exhibition of failure, no "spot on his uniform," as he called it. His demeanor in the sale of Louisiana to the United States was so jaunty that he deceived even the elect. But the plan itself had been as far-sighted as any he had ever formed. He told his most intimate counsellor, Marbois, that he desired by the sale to thwart Great Britain and keep her from seizing it;[1] his offer was the first in that series of shrewd and crafty measures whereby the War of 1812 was brought on, and the embryonic nationality of the United States was started on its evolution into a first-class power. To Napoleon it seemed clear that American development would produce a maritime rival of Great Britain, which might in time destroy her ascendancy on the seas, or at least counterbalance it in a measure and open the channels of trade to the continental nations, which possessed less genius for sea-faring than the two Anglo-Saxon rivals. That he ceded not a part but the whole territory and broke his promise to Spain is a fact which has been interpreted as proving both a desire to spite the power which had so often thwarted him, and a determination to efface the memory of his colonial failure from the minds of men. The latter proposition may have some truth in it, but the former lacks all proof. He intended, as his whole career proved, and in particular, as the events of 1808 at Bayonne conclusively demonstrate, eventually to assume the supremacy over all Spain's possessions. It was not likely that he would spite himself and trouble his whole future policy by any gratuitous or unnecessary diminution of Spanish lands in America; yet he sold us, not merely New Orleans and Louisiana, but also a claim to the Spanish lands of West Florida and Texas. This he unquestionably did to prevent Great Britain from securing control of the Gulf, a weapon which he preferred to see in our hands during the coming struggle, even at the price of our retaining it permanently. More than any other policy this would hamper England and set free all his own resources for European warfare.

The next and last of Napoleon's colonial enterprises was also connected with Spanish America. No sooner had he rid himself as he supposed of the Spanish Bourbons at Bayonne, in 1808, than he turned his attention to the question of how he might best secure for the house of Napoleon ascendancy in the Spanish colonies of America. The flight of the royal family of Portugal to Brazil, though apparently a triumph for French diplomacy, was probably the gravest of those disasters which in the end overwhelmed the Napoleonic Continental System. Their establishment at Rio Janeiro opened markets to Great Britain which relieved the glut of her store-houses, saved British manufacturers from bankruptcy, and at the danger-point restored the credit of the country to a certain extent. It looked as if the ruin of Portugal in Europe might work the ruin of France through America. The opportunity to save himself occurred to Napoleon by means of one of that interesting class of French gentlemen-adventurers who in foreign lands survived the decadence of their class at home.

---

[1] Livingston to Madison, May 12, 1803, *American State Papers*, *Foreign Relations*, II.

The France of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries teemed with children, and was in the enjoyment of a surplus population as turbulent, hungry and enterprising as any that ever came from the womb of Germany or England. When Colbert had established the French navy, he proceeded with magnificent enterprise to found colonies in one unbroken succession. Canada with Newfoundland, Louisiana, the Antilles and the islands of East Africa were attached to the French monarchy, while in 1688 the first settlement of Frenchmen in India inaugurated a splendid career for French adventurers. For some generations the French continued to furnish numerous and excellent colonists; this, too, in spite of the coalition of England with Holland, to prevent the union of the Spanish with the French crown. Even though the Peace of Utrecht deprived France of Newfoundland, Hudson's Bay and Nova Scotia, yet in the middle of the last century, while Great Britain held only the Atlantic seaboard of the temperate zone in North America, France had all the great river valleys of the continent, and in India she far outstripped Great Britain. Moreover it was Dupleix who made the modern British system in India possible. To him is due the idea of native Oriental troops, with European officers. It is estimated that the commercial marine of France during the earlier years of the reign of Louis XV. brought in two hundred and fifty million livres a year. This splended inheritance the prodigal dissipated and the tale of French colonial decadence has been outlined in another connection. The bottom of the decline was reached when, by his code, Napoleon compelled the division of estates and thus made the "two-child family" characteristic of France, and when by his wars he united all Europe in the desire to despoil France of everything, including her colonies. In 1815 she retained but slender colonial strength and that little mainly through the adroitness of Talleyrand: some of the Antilles, Cayenne, Réunion, Pondicherry and Chandernagor.

The men who had earned their livelihoods in the conduct of French colonial affairs abroad found life intolerable at home, as their sphere of activity contracted more and more. According they took service wherever they could find it. Among these adventurers was a cadet of a noble Poitevin family, Jacques de Liniers, who was trained in what was then the most brilliant military school in all Europe, the court of Ximenes, Grand Master of Malta. There he learned Spanish thoroughly; afterwards he served under O'Reilly in the Spanish expedition of 1774 against Algiers. Thereupon he entered the French Naval School, passed his examinations as ensign, fought on various vessels of the French fleet throughout the war of the American Revolution, and at the siege of Gibraltar. When the Treaty of Versailles was signed he again joined the Spanish fleet in a second unlucky expedition against Algiers and for his service was made a captain in the Spanish navy. In this service he crossed to Montevideo, and spent about twelve busy but uneventful years as a colonial agent under the Spanish government. Great Britain was much concerned to open all South American ports to her commerce as an offset to the almost entire loss of her continental trade in Europe. The Spanish viceroyalty of the Rio de la Plata included the vast districts now designated by the names of Bolivia, Paraguay, Uruguay and the Argentine. From 1796 to 1802 De Liniers managed to keep under control this extended and sparsely-settled land, known in England as the Plate Country. This he did by means of a flotilla of mosquito gunboats and cruisers, which scoured the seacoast and rivers; for the next three years he was governor of the district known as Paraguay, and from 1805 to 1808 he was stationed at Buenos Ayres, as commander of the gunboats he had equipped to repel the British.

This task grew daily more difficult after the rupture of the peace of Amiens. Finally, on June 10, 1806, a powerful British fleet under Popham and Beresford, six frigates, three corvettes and five transports with 1400 picked troops, appeared unexpectedly in the Plate River. The wretched colony was then under a faithful but incapable viceroy, the Marquis of Sobremonte. He and De Liniers gathered a handful of the few regulars scattered up and down through the country into the nucleus of an army and called out for a supplementary force, such militia as could be assembled. Owing mainly to the daring and dash of Beresford, and to the hopes of commercial advantage which Admiral Popham held out, in formally granting to the people of the viceroyalty free trade with Great Britain, the invaders at first met with considerable success; but De Liniers was indefatigable in his agitations far and near throughout the more settled portions of the Argentine district, and eventually recalled the population almost *en masse* to their Spanish allegiance. With a little band of recruits not more numerous than the veteran soldiers of his foe, he began his attacks on the British and with each successful movement in advance attracted more and more volunteers, until finally, on August 12, he overwhelmed and captured Beresford's little army at Buenos Ayres, with its ammunition, arms and standards. During these exciting events Sobremonte was absent in the interior. The messengers charged with the news of De Liniers' exploit found the viceroy marching towards the coast, at the head of three thousand men, a force which he had raised during his absence; they had to communicate unwelcome tidings, the voice of public opinion demanded that De Liniers should thereafter be first in military command, and to this a grudging assent was extorted from the tardy viceroy. The government at Madrid in due course confirmed the popular choice.

To Napoleon De Liniers wrote somewhat later that the recapture of Buenos Ayres had been nothing, the difficulty was to keep it; and to this task the commander bent all his energies, fortifying, collecting cannon, guns and ammunition, raising new troops and consolidating the loyalty, which, turning for the hour against the feebleness of Spain, considered the Frenchman as the saviour not only of Argentina but of the neighboring lands in South America. His exertions were terrible and the sacrifices of the people unsurpassed in the history of popular uprising. The colony, with no help from Spain and no regard for the policy of the mother country, devised and established its own safeguards. It felt itself virtually independent of the wretched court administration, nominally guided by the unhappy King Charles IV. but really left to the incapacity of Godoy, the queen's favorite, who wore the titles of Prime Minister and Prince of the Peace.

The independent feeling of the Argentine was further strengthened by the repulse of the second British expedition. In successive installments nearly 12,000 soldiers had been sent in from England and the Cape to overwhelm the South Americans. Whitelocke, a court favorite of no ability, was in military command. The efforts of the newcomers to land were successful, and in the British fleet which was to co-operate were no fewer than twenty ships. The combined army and navy presented a formidable aspect on June 28, 1807, when ready for offensive operations. It seems likely that De Liniers had by this time been approached by Napoleon, either through secret agents or by letter; in the previous year he had written to the Emperor, and now he made two reports of his resistance, one to Godoy, one to Napoleon; that to King Charles IV. was signed by the *cabildo* or elective council of Buenos Ayres, an institution which was a survival of the medieval liberties of Castile. From these three documents it appears that De Liniers did not entirely rise to the height of his task. In the open, around Buenos Ayres, he displayed over-confidence and met with repulse, but when the city was actually menaced on July 4, 1807, by a force of 8500 British, the inhabitants rose in a body at his call. The effort of Whitelocke to storm Buenos Ayres on the fifth was ill-judged. There was a magnificent display of courage on the part of his men and in some districts of the town his subordinates were partially successful, but the infuriated people fought like tigers from windows and barricades, the loss of life was frightful and De Liniers, whose valor had made him more conspicuous than ever, proposed towards evening, in the name of humanity, a cessation of hostilities, promising that he would restore to the British all the prisoners captured, both that day and the year before, on condition that the entire Plate country including Montevideo should be freed. Whitelocke tried by protracting the negotiation to gain time for his reserve to come in, but his scheme was too patent. The fighting was renewed and the British gained a slight advantage, but with such loss as to prove their case desperate, and on the seventh a treaty was signed on De Liniers' terms. For this signal victory De Liniers was appointed viceroy. For the failure of their enterprise Whitelocke was permanently disgraced and Popham received a formal reprimand.

The new viceroy soon found himself in an almost impossible position. His people had tasted the sweets of independent action and the delights of democracy. From contact with the English they had learned to discourse of commercial liberty. The *cabildo*, composed of men of pure Spanish race, was the very head and front of the popular movement, which, though recognizing De Liniers' services, was indisposed to respect the royal authority which he now represented. In particular, Godoy was even more despised and hated in South America than in Spain, if that were possible. To hold the wise balance of his power De Liniers therefore would have required not merely the dash and devotion of the medieval soldier, which he was, but the tact of a modern diplomat, which he was not. But few vessels from Spanish ports escaped the vigilance of the British cruisers, so that communications were most irregular. It was May 1808 when De Liniers received his formal appointment; two months later came the news of the revolution of Aranjuez, which deposed the reigning King of Spain. Supposing that Charles IV.'s abdication was final, De Liniers felt safe in preparing to proclaim his son, the popular Ferdinand, as seventh of his name among the kings of Spain. This measure at least, he felt certain, would meet with something like general approval. During the years of his service as coast guardian at Montevideo and Buenos Ayres, De Liniers had formed a wide acquaintance with men of all nations.

Among his fellow-countrymen he had known two in particular, Jurien, afterwards the distinguished admiral, and De Sassenay, a nobleman who, having lost his lands and having taken refuge in the United States, had made two voyages to South America as supercargo. During the course of the first De Sassenay spent six months in Buenos Ayres and the second venture proving troublesome he was compelled to reside in that city nearly two years, from September 1801 to May 1803. During both these periods he was on terms of intimacy with De Liniers. Finally in 1804 he succeeded after infinite pains and annoyance in securing amnesty from Bonaparte. Returning to his native land he bought in such of his paternal estates as were in the market and settled down, as he supposed, to the life of a country gentleman. His life in that capacity proved in many respects unsuccessful and vexatious, and he contemplated returning to America, actually making the effort to negotiate an exchange of his French estates for a Virginia domain. At last in 1806 he abandoned all idea of a second exile and began a course of improvements and investments which he hoped would restore his fortunes.

De Sassenay's career as an émigré was of course well known to the French authorities. No sooner had Napoleon secured the abdication of the Spanish Bourbons, at Bayonne, than he sent an order post-haste to Chalons-sur-Saône, where Sassenay lived, to summon the astonished and, as he believed himself to be, obscure personage to the imperial presence. Bayonne was reached on May 29, 1808, and amazement gave way to stupor when the Emperor in an interview lasting but a few minutes, with curt and meaning phrase, informed his visitor that in twenty-four hours he must be on the way to South America. The thousands of miles of stormy sea, rendered unsafe by remorseless English cruisers, were to be traversed in a little brig of a few hundred tons, the *Consolateur*. She actually put to sea next day, May 30, and on board was the Marquis of Sassenay, with full instructions from Champagny, Minister of Foreign Affairs. The shock and despair of his wife and family when they received the news by imperial messenger can be imagined. Perhaps no incident in Napoleon's whole career better revealed a certain side of his character. Twice, as has been said, in 1806 and 1807, he had received letters from De Liniers, giving details of the French adventurer's life and mission. The Spaniards in America were as complete a mystery and puzzle to Napoleon as were their compatriots in Spain. With his eye fixed on the dazzling enterprise of securing at a stroke that one of the twenty Spanish viceroyalties in the new world, which by climate, soil and population was far and away the most desirable, he seemed to have forgotten the measure of a man, gauging others by his own powers. De Liniers, dazzled as he was known to be by the Napoleonic effulgence, was to bring his viceroyalty and lay it at the feet of imperial France at the first notification; who so fit to carry the message as a French royalist rallied to the Empire, and a crony of the viceroy at that? Thought was scarcely swifter than the deed. In such an enterprise no consideration of commonplace human interest could weigh for a moment. No wonder men quailed before such a mind and will, yielding as they must without discussion, but hissing "tyrant" between their shut teeth and closed lips. For seventy days the *Consolateur* tossed on the broad Atlantic before reaching her haven. She was not molested by the much-feared cruisers, but she was sadly driven about by storms. Sassenay had abundant time to ponder his instructions. He was to disembark according to his own judgment wherever the vessel would be safe from capture. He was then to deliver his dispatches to De Liniers, explaining, as if he had been an eye-witness, what had been seen and heard at Bayonne, how delighted the Spanish people were with the prospect of regeneration under Joseph Bonaparte, "what glory environs France and what influence the powerful genius which governs her exerts over Europe for which he lays down the law." He was carefully to observe the effects produced on the authorities by the news of "the happy change wrought in Spain;" to gather all the information possible about Spanish America, including Peru and Chili, if that might be, and to bring back all the knowledge as quickly as possible. Sassenay landed at Maldonado and pressed on to Montevideo, where he found Elio, the governor, on the point of administering to the people the oath of fidelity to Ferdinand VII. To the envoy's suggestion that the governor await the effect of the news from Bayonne at Buenos Ayres, Elio gave a dry refusal. Hurrying breathlessly on, Sassenay reached the capital on August 13, expecting to be received by his old comrade with open arms. Nothing of the sort happened. The envoy of Napoleon was treated with cold formality, left to cool his heels in ante-chambers and finally granted an audience by the viceroy, not alone, but surrounded by his jealous coadjutors. To this assembly, Sassenay read the acts by which Charles IV., Ferdinand VII. and the infantas renounced the Spanish throne, and the dispatches of Champagny in which, with mingled threat and cajolery, Joseph's recognition as king was recommended. To these were appended the formal command of the Spanish ministers and of the Council of Castile, that the oath of allegiance to Ferdinand, previously enjoined by them, should not be administered.

This was the signal for an explosion of anger from the colonial authorities. Sassenay was ordered to leave the country that very night. Liniers succeeded at a later hour in securing a private interview with the envoy: vague hopes of ultimate success for Napoleon's plan were held out, but for the moment, it was explained, nothing could be done. Sassenay must return at all hazards. Accordingly he started at once and reached Montevideo safely. Elio, however, prevented his guest from embarking and held him a virtual prisoner. This was the beginning of disaster for De Liniers. The people of Buenos Ayres, and in fact of the whole viceroyalty, felt the arrival of an envoy from Napoleon to be an interference with their independent action. They were saturated with the influences already recounted, due largely to the recent success of the United States in securing independence, in part to their own efforts in driving away the British invaders. At all hazards they must conduct their own affairs without foreign meddling.

The first proclamation of De Liniers, issued on August 15, set forth that Napoleon's conduct had the hearty support of Spain and begged the colonists to repose confidence in the constituted authority. It was ill received. To recover himself, De Liniers advanced the ceremony of administering the oath of allegiance to Ferdinand by several days and began to abuse Napoleon. This about-face had no effect; the viceroy was now suspected both as being a Frenchman and as sympathizing with the creole party, which desired to rule the natives, to the exclusion of the Spaniards. A revolution broke out in Montevideo, spread to Buenos Ayres, and though held in check by De Liniers for some time, was finally successful, because of events which he could not control. Soon after the national uprising of Spain, the Junta of Cadiz had sent out a new viceroy to replace De Liniers, a certain Cisneros, who had orders to favor the Spanish party, to the exclusion of the native-born, and to send De Liniers back to Spain. Thereupon De Liniers resigned. The new viceroy dared exercise no violence against a man so popular with great numbers in the province as the French Liberator continued to be, and permitted his predecessor to retire as a free man to Cordova in the interior.

The fall of De Liniers was really due to Napoleon's overhaste to seize a great colonial empire; further it was the signal for the revolt which eventually severed Spanish South America from its old allegiance. On May 25, 1810, the incompetent viceroy of the Junta was overthrown by a revolution of those who despised Spain and detested the wretched rule which represented her authority. De Liniers put himself at the head of the royalist party, which he believed stood for good order, but was betrayed, taken prisoner, and executed, as an enemy of liberty.

Sassenay escaped with his life. He suffered a cruel imprisonment in Montevideo until 1809, when he was sent to Cadiz, and all trace of him was lost to his friends. By the most persistent efforts Mme. de Sassenay secured the ear of Napoleon, who would gladly have forgotten his unlucky agent, obtained the material assistance of a money grant, and sailed for London, where she so ingratiated herself with the great ladies of the court that the British government instituted inquiries about her husband. Not only were the whereabouts of the unhappy man discovered, but at the instance of the British minister he was released and restored to his family.

Thus ended the last of Napoleon's dreams of colonial empire. They were splendid visions one and all, but even heroic minds cannot be ubiquitous, and his was thenceforth fully occupied in the measures essential for his long resistance to the superior strength which overwhelmed him in the end. The recital of these plans in chronological order is not, however, destitute of historical value. On the contrary it proves that while Napoleon actually did throw the French colonial system into bankruptcy, yet it was not his purpose so to do: had he been able to make good his European plans he would have stopped at nothing to plant French empire both in the Far East and on the mainland of both Americas.

W. M. Sloane.

HOLMES VS. WALTON: THE NEW JERSEY PRECEDENT:[1]

A CHAPTER IN THE HISTORY OF JUDICIAL POWER AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL LEGISLATION

AFTER the battle of Monmouth in June, 1778, the British commander made his way to Sandy Hook and thence to New York, where he established permanent headquarters, retaining, during the rest of the war, possession of Staten Island adjacent to New Jersey. On the 8th of October, 1778, the New Jersey legislature passed a law to prevent the increasing evil of intercourse with the enemy. This act made it "lawful for any person or persons whomsoever to seize and secure provisions, goods, wares and merchandize attempted to be carried or conveyed into or brought from within the lines or encampments or any place in the possession of the subjects or troops of the King of Great Britain." These goods and the persons in whose possession they might be found were to be taken before a justice of the peace of the county. The law required the justice, on the demand of either party, to grant a jury according to the law of February 11, 1775, which provided for a jury of six men, and further stipulated, "that in every cause where a jury of six men give a verdict as aforesaid there shall be no appeal allowed." The law of October, 1778, further provided that if the plaintiff should win the suit the proceeds from the sale of the goods were to be divided among the persons seizing them.[1]

---

[1] The following pages include portions of a paper prepared about fifteen years ago and read successively before a private literary club, "The Fortnightly," of Newark, N. J., in 1883, before the Rutgers College chapter of the Phi Beta Kappa in 1884, and before the American Historical Association, April 28, 1886. The paper was never printed in full though an abstract of it appears in the *Papers* of the Historical Association, Vol. II., No. 1, page 45.

The original paper was a study of the growth of the power of the judiciary to pronounce upon the constitutionality of laws, but the propriety of publishing any other part of it than the one here presented has been entirely obviated by the careful treatment of the subject in late years by several authors, and especially in the exhaustive work of the late Brinton Coxe of Philadelphia, *Judicial Power and Unconstitutional Legislation.*

In that work, however, on page 222, the author, accepting the conjecture of Mr. William M. Meigs, is inclined to assign the New Jersey case of Holmes *vs.* Walton to a date no earlier than 1786, whereas the constitutional question was raised before the court as early as November, 1779, and decided on the 7th of September, 1780, the case thus taking precedence in time of the other cases of like sort in which the principle was clearly acted upon.

Furthermore, Mr. Meigs, and Mr. Coxe following him, being without materials for an adequate knowledge of the case pass it over with slight consideration of its possible influence in serving to widen the scope of judicial power in our federal system. This meagre treatment in a work speaking with all but final authority on its subject-matter, as well as numerous letters of inquiry concerning the case, which the present writer has received, lead him to give its history, in the hope that the following pages will call general attention to this early action of New Jersey and secure recognition of its value in determining forces which in the Constitution of the United States "establish justice."

By virtue of this law, Elisha Walton, a major of militia, seized a quantity of goods in the possession of John Holmes and Solomon Ketcham, whom he charged with having brought them from within the lines of the enemy. The goods were of considerable value, there being between seven hundred and eight hundred yards of silk, between four hundred and five hundred yards of silk gauze, "mode," and many other articles, "such a quantity and such a quality as could not be purchased in all the stores of New Jersey."[2] The case was tried before John Anderson, a justice of the peace of Monmouth County, on the 24th of May, 1779, with a jury of six men, who brought in a verdict in favor of Walton and judgment was given accordingly.[3]

While the suit was pending, the defendants had already applied to the Supreme Court then in session at Burlington, and the Chief Justice, Robert Morris, issued a writ of certiorari to Anderson, returnable at the next session of the Supreme Court to be held at Hillsborough in Somerset County, the first Tuesday of September. Meantime Morris resigned his seat on the bench and on the 10th of June David Brearly was appointed Chief Justice. The court opened at Hillsborough on the 7th of September, and on the 9th it was ordered that the case of Holmes *vs.* Walton be argued on the Thursday of the next term. Accordingly on Thursday, November 11, 1779, the case was argued before the Supreme Court sitting at Trenton.[4] In offering his argument for the plaintiffs in certiorari, William Willcocks, their attorney, filed his reasons why the judgment of Justice Anderson should be reversed. The seventh reason reads as follows: "Because the jury sworn to try the above cause and on whose verdict judgment was entered, consisted of six men only, when by the Laws of the Land it should have consisted of twelve men." The same attorney, at the same trial, also filed separately "additional reasons," which read as follows :

---

[1] Pamphlet *Laws*, 1778. See also Wilson's *Laws of New Jersey*, Appendix V.

[2] Papers on file in the office of the Supreme Court of New Jersey, Envelope 44928. In the later proceedings in the case, in April, 1781, the amount of the claim of Walton on behalf of himself and the state was, in an order of the court, stated to be "twenty-nine thousand, four hundred and twenty-eight pounds, thirteen shillings and fourpence half penny" (original files Supreme Court). If we reckon the pound "proclamation money" at about $2.43, the claim must have exceeded $70,000, probably in the depreciated currency of the day.

[3] Minutes of Supreme Court, original in clerk's office in Trenton.

[4] *Ibid.*

> "For that the said justice had not jurisdiction of the said cause or plaint but the same was *coram non judice.*
>
> "For that the jury who tryed the said plaint before the said justice consisted of six men only contrary to law.
>
> "For that the jury who tried the said plaint before the said justice consisted of six men only contrary to the constitution of New Jersey.
>
> "For that the proceedings and trial in the said plaint in the court below, and the judgment thereon given were had and given contrary to the constitution, practices and laws of the land." [1]

At the close of the argument, the record shows that "on the reasons filed a *curia advisare vult* is entered." Under date of the following Monday, November 15, the minutes state that "the court will further advise on the arguments had on this cause until the next term." In the succeeding term, April, 1780, the minute states, "The court not being ready to give judgment on the reasons filed and argued in this cause—Ordered, that a *curia advisare vult* until next term be entered; on motion of Mr. Elias Boudinot." In the minutes of the May term there is no record of the case. At the succeeding term, however, on Thursday, September 7, 1780, ten months after the case had been argued, judgment was given.[2]

Before investigating the nature of the decision given and the probable cause of the delay in rendering it, it may be proper to inquire with what color of right the counsel could urge his plea against the constitutional validity of the statute of October 8, 1778, which allowed a six-man jury. Section XXII. of the constitution of New Jersey, adopted July 2, 1776, reads as follows: "That the common law of England, as well as so much of the statute law as have been heretofore practiced in this colony shall still remain in force, until they shall be altered by a future law of the legislature; such parts only excepted as are repugnant to the rights and privileges contained in this Charter; and that the inestimable right of trial by jury shall remain confirmed as a part of the law of this colony, without repeal forever." The final section of the same constitution prescribes as a part of the oath to be taken by each member of the legislature, that he will not assent to any law, vote, or proceeding to repeal or annul "that part of the twenty-second section respecting the trial by jury."

The assumption that the phrase "trial by jury" as thus used meant exactly twelve jurors must find its warrant farther back. In addition to immemorial custom, the "common law" of England, which may have been held to have had validity in this case, two documents may have been appealed to as fundamentally relevant and as constituting in New Jersey a part of the "law of the land:" the first, Chapter XXII. of the West Jersey "Concessions and Agreements" of 1676, "Not to be altered by the legislative authority," which begins thus, "That the trial of all causes, civil and criminal, shall be heard and decided by the verdict or judgment of twelve honest men of the neighborhood." The second was a formal declaration of the "Rights and Privileges" passed by the House of Representatives in East Jersey on March 13, 1699, and accepted by the governor and council, which asserted that "all trials shall be by the verdict of twelve men."[1] Other acts of the assembly in each of the two Jersey provinces before their union in 1702, show that the right to a trial before a jury of twelve men was regarded as fundamental; notably the act of November, 1681, in West Jersey, and that of March, 1683, in East Jersey.[2]

---

[1] Files Supreme Court, Envelope 18354.

[2] Minutes Supreme Court.

The foregoing details have been recited as inferentially the basis of the argument of the attorney for the plaintiffs and of the decision of the court rendered on September 7, 1780. On that day a full bench was present, David Brearly, the Chief Justice, with Isaac Smith and John Cleves Symmes, his associates.[3] The minute of the court reads thus: "John Holmes and Solomon Ketcham *vs.* Elisha Walton, sur certiorari to John Anderson, Esq. . . . This cause having been argued several terms past and the court having taken time to consider the same, and being now ready to deliver their opinion gave the same seriatim for the plaintiffs in certiorari. And on motion of Boudinot for the plaintiffs, judgment is ordered for the plaintiffs, and that the judgment of the justice in the court below be reversed and the said plaintiffs be restored to all things, etc."[4]

Persistent search has failed to discover the opinion of Chief Justice Brearly delivered in this case. It was probably an oral opinion and never written. Happily, however, there exists incontestable proof as to its import. On the afternoon of the 8th of December, 1780, in the House of Assembly, "a petition from sixty inhabitants of the county of Monmouth was presented and read, complaining that the justices of the Supreme Court have set aside some of the laws as unconstitutional, and made void the proceedings of the magistrates, though strictly agreeable to the said laws, to the encouragement of the disaffected and great loss to the loyal citizens of the state and praying redress."[1]

---

[1] Leaming and Spicer, *Grants and Concessions*, pp. 372, 398.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 235, 428.

[3] For sketches of these judges see Elmer's *Reminiscences*, pp. 271 ff.

[4] Minutes of Supreme Court, p. 343.

A second unquestionable proof that the decision of Brearly nullified the laws allowing a jury of six men appears in the subsequent proceedings of the Holmes-Walton case, which dragged along for years. In July, 1781, in the course of the new trial before the justice, ordered by the Supreme Court, Willcocks, counsel for Holmes, argues thus: "That the present cause being commenced and undetermined at the time of the late law authorizing a trial by twelve men [i. e., an act of December 22, 1780, to be referred to later] it is not comprehended by the late law, it not having in it any retrospective clause; and as a trial by six men is unconstitutional, there is no law existing by which this cause could be tried."[2]

A message from Governor Livingston to the assembly on the 7th of June, 1782, is not without significance in the history of the recognition of this judicial function at this time and presumably in connection with this case. After stating that the chancellor (in that day, the governor) must seal a writ of replevin on the application of any citizen, Livingston continues, "But if an act of legislation can constitutionally be made, declaring that no person in whose possession any goods, wares or merchandise shall be seized and captured as effects illegally imported from the enemy, shall be entitled to such a writ . . . . if such an act, I say, should be passed it would probably encourage such seizures and give additional check to that most pernicious and detestable trade, the total suppression of which is one of the most important objects that can engage the attention of the legislature."[3]

From the contemporary evidence cited above no doubt can remain that Brearly met the question of constitutionality squarely and on September 7, 1780, announced the principle of judicial guardianship of the organic law against attempted or inadvertent encroachment by the ordinary law.

To form an adequate estimate of the historical value of this decision it is essential to ascertain how the principle thus enforced was received by the people of the state. The protest against the judgment by citizens of Monmouth County has already been cited. Other petitions poured in upon the assembly from the frontier counties of Monmouth, Middlesex and Essex, which Livingston in 1778 reported to Washington as "almost worn out in defending their own borders."[1] One of these petitions read in the assembly on November 21, 1780, prayed that the determination of causes arising under these laws, generally known as the "seizure laws," before a justice of the peace agreeably to the verdict of a jury may be final, and that such causes may not be removable to the Supreme Court by a certiorari.[1]

---

[1] *Votes and Proceedings of House of Assembly*, p. 52; cf. *Votes and Proceedings* for 1780, pp. 36, 39, 54 *et passim.*

[2] Supreme Court Files, Envelope 44928.

[3] *Votes and Proceedings*, House of Assembly, June 7, 1782.

The evils of the illicit trade with the British during the last five years of the war can hardly be exaggerated. The practice was tantamount to treason, giving great aid and comfort to the enemy. Year by year and twice a year, laws, inspired by strong patriotic impulses and drawn with great care, were enacted only to be evaded, and the illicit trade went on. Small wonder then if the temptation came to the long-suffering patriots to disregard some of the ordinary safeguards of personal rights if thereby the men who were helping to prolong the war could be brought to justice! The plea of necessity must have weighed strongly with David Brearly, with Smith and Symmes, all of whom were staunch patriots, as each had proved by service in the field. The law of October 8, 1778, had passed both houses without a dissenting vote, and if ever extraordinary war-powers might be construed into the constitution this was the occasion for their recognition. As we have seen, two terms of the court intervened before the decision in the case of Holmes *vs.* Walton was rendered. From the judicial records the reason for the long delay is not apparent, but the proceedings in the legislature in the interval throw some light on the matter. On the very next day after the argument before the court, on Friday, November 12, 1779, Deare, the Middlesex member of the legislative council, obtained leave to bring in a bill amending the "seizure acts." This bill in its final form passed the council on the 6th of December. We do not know what the provisions of the bill were, but we do know that the House of Assembly attempted to amend it by a clause confirming the requirement of the six-man jury in past and pending cases. This amendment the council refused to accept. Evidently then the council wished to come to the relief of the court and to the defence of constitutional rights. The house at first refused to appoint a committee of conference but yielded and made the appointment on the 23d of December. The committee of conference made its report which was adopted by the assembly on the 24th and by the council on the 25th.[2] The act which thus passed on Christmas day, 1779, provides in its preamble and first section as follows:

---

[1] *Votes and Proceedings*, p. 36.

[2] Minutes of Assembly, pp. 47, 62, 86, 87, 92, 93, 96, 98, 101. Journal of Council, *passim*.

"and whereas causes of considerable value may by virtue of this or the before recited acts [acts of October 8 and December 22, 1778] be prosecuted before a justice of the peace wherein it may be prudent to have the judgment of a greater number than six jurors; Be it enacted, &c., that in all causes hereafter to be prosecuted before any justice of the peace, by virtue of this or the said recited acts, it shall and may be lawful for either of the parties in such suit to demand a jury of twelve men, which jury such justice is hereby empowered to grant and to issue a venire accordingly."[1] The act appears to have been in the nature of a compromise, for while its provisions do not maintain the validity of the six-man jury in past and pending cases, on the other hand for the future, the justice of the lower court was not *required* but only *empowered* to grant a jury of twelve men.[2] The concession in the law by which an option was given to the magistrate to grant or deny a jury of twelve men, rather than six, did not afford a perfect constitutional security. If then the court was awaiting action on the seizure laws by the legislature which, by devising a remedy for the alleged infraction of constitutional rights in the past and for their security in the future, might possibly forestall the necessity of a decision annulling the law of 1778, the delay was in vain. But the court probably reserved its decision through several sessions from a genuine wish to consider the case in all its bearings—"curia advisare vult." This more particularly appears in a letter from the justices of the Supreme Court to the Legislature dated May 13, and from a law passed on June 17, 1780, in consequence of the letter and following its suggestions. This law reads as follows:

> "Whereas causes to a very considerable value are now frequently brought to trial before, and determined by, a single justice of the peace in a summary manner by virtue of the act entitled 'An act to prevent the subjects, etc.,' and the supplementary acts thereto; and whereas some of the justices before whom such trials are had commit errors in the determination of them in matters of form, whereby the judgment is reversed on certiorari and the cause lost without any default of the party although the merits are in his favor, for remedy whereof
>
> "Be it Enacted, etc., That in all such causes where the judgment of the justice shall be reversed in the supreme court on certiorari for informality of proceedings, or *any other cause* not essential to the merits of the suits, such judgment of reversal shall only affect the parties with respect to the costs of the suit; and it shall and may be lawful for the supreme court on such reversal to award a new trial on the merits in the court be-

---

[1] *Original Laws of New Jersey*, p. 49. Wilson's *Laws*, Appendix.

[2] That this distinction in such use of these terms then obtained seems clear from the preamble and from the fact that "required" is used in the law of 1778 and in the law passed after the decision of the court in 1780.

low where the cause was originally determined; any law, usage or custom to the contrary notwithstanding."[1]

This letter and the law adopting its recommendations lead to the conclusion that the court was working its way to the just and discriminating use of the highest judicial function, to the principle, namely, that a law is no law only so far as it is in exact conflict with the constitution; that all its other provisions if possible must stand. Thus a valuable service was rendered; the scope of the application of this judicial power was thereby in anticipation defined. When they were ready Brearly and his associates did not flinch. Being practically without precedent to guide them, at the very beginning of the next session of the court, the judges severally gave their opinion and from the 7th of September, 1780, this function of the judiciary, this principle of judicial power over unconstitutional legislation, has held sway in New Jersey. The brave and honorable act met with protests, as we have seen, but the body of the people acquiesced, and a legislature, chosen by the people the next month, with the protests before it, ratified the action of the judiciary after prolonged consideration, by passing a law, which in its 13th section *requires* the justice on the demand of either party in such suits to grant a jury of twelve men, and ordered the act to be printed in the *Gazette* newspaper and extra copies to be printed.[2]

The full significance within New Jersey of the decree of the court and the action of the legislature is acknowledged in the following words of Chief Justice Kirkpatrick in 1804, in his opinion in the case of State *vs.* Parkhurst: "This question" (viz. whether the court has power to control the operation of an act of the legislature upon the principle of its being contrary to the constitution) "was brought forward in the case of Holmes *vs.* Walton, arising on what was then called the seizure laws. There it had been enacted that the trial should be by a jury of six men; and it was objected that this was not a constitutional jury; and so it was held; and the act upon solemn argument was adjudged to be unconstitutional and in that case inoperative. And upon this decision the act, or at least that part of it which relates to the six-man jury, was repealed and a constitutional jury of twelve men substituted in its place. This then is not only a judicial decision but a decision recognized and acquiesced in by the legislative body of the State."[3]

---

[1] For the letter of the justices of the Supreme Court to the speaker, see *Votes and Proceedings*, General Assembly, Saturday, May 13, 1780. For the Act of June 17, 1780, see *Session Laws*, p. 121, Chapter LIII.

[2] Act of December 22, 1780. For the series of acts on this subject see the Appendix of Wilson's *Laws of New Jersey*.

[3] 4 Halsted, 444.

Was the case of Holmes *vs.* Walton of value beyond the borders of New Jersey? It made a deep impression in one important quarter at least. In 1785, Gouverneur Morris sent to the Pennsylvania legislature an address, whose object was to dissuade that body from passing a law to repeal the charter of the National Bank. In the course of that address he says: "A law was once passed in New Jersey, which the judges pronounced unconstitutional, and therefore void. Surely no good citizen can wish to see this point decided in the tribunals of Pennsylvania. Such power in judges is dangerous; but unless it somewhere exists, the time employed in framing a bill of rights and form of government was merely thrown away."[1]

The late Brinton Coxe, in his recently published work on *Judicial Power and Unconstitutional Legislation*, has argued with exhaustive force that the framers of the Constitution intended by the language used in Art. VI., Clause 2, and Art. III., Section 2, an *express* grant to the judiciary to pronounce void unconstitutional legislation. Whether we hold as Hamilton does in the *Federalist* that this judicial power is not expressly but beyond question impliedly granted, and as Marshall does in Marbury *vs.* Madison, when he derives it solely by inference and implication, or with Coxe that it is *expressly* granted though not *defined*, it is certain that the framers of the Constitution intended to lodge this power in that instrument, and this intention, the records clearly show, became fixed only during the progress of the Federal Convention. The cases of the application of this principle in the states, previous to 1787, had not led to the proposal of its embodiment in the "Virginia plan" of reforming the Union. Madison, that careful student of government, had chosen not to provide in that plan "this security for the justice of a state against its power." Hamilton in the debates in the Convention and in his "plan" does not contend for it. It is not brought forward by that learned civilian, Wilson. The principle of judicial invalidation of laws on the ground of unconstitutionality was no novelty to these men,[2] and the specific application of the principle had been brought to the attention of the whole Convention in one of its earliest sittings on the 4th of June, when Gerry made the oft-quoted remark, "In some of the states the judges had actually set aside laws as being against the constitution. This was done too with general approbation." To no one of all the cases "in some of the states" which are known to us can the remark of Gerry apply with so much pertinency as to the New Jersey case of Holmes *vs.* Walton. In Rhode Island certainly "general approbation" did not follow the action of the judges in the case of Trevett *vs.* Weeden. A knowledge of the North Carolina case, Bayard *vs.* Singleton, had not yet arrived. The New Jersey case had been received, as we have seen, "with general approbation" by the people of the state as shown in the acquiescence of the legislature and the approbation of the governor. The very fact that this principle was not novel made its rejection by the prime movers of reform the more significant when finally accepted by them. The stone which the builders refused was to become the chief corner-stone in the edifice. All honor to those at whose instance it was proposed for the very foundation of the political structure! But we do not perfectly know through whose influence and action this was done. It is a question of probability.

---

[1] Sparks's *Life of Gouverneur Morris*, III. 438.

[2] As evincing a general recognition of this principle in colonial days (1759), see Colden's Letter on Smith's *History of New York*, *New York Historical Society Collections* for 1869, page 204.

The guiding spirits of the Convention were evidently reluctant to sanction the full application of this judicial function, at least in its use of testing state laws by the Constitution of the United States. The "Virginia plan," as all know, proposed to vest in the national legislature a legislative veto on state laws, and this was accepted by the Convention in committee of the whole. When, however, the vexing question of equal or proportionate representation as between the large and small states was adjusted, a resolution was adopted *nem. con.* on July 17, which made the constitutional acts and treaties of the United States the supreme law of the several states and bound the state judges so to hold notwithstanding state laws to the contrary. The words of this resolution are in all but the smallest particulars identical with a paragraph of the plan submitted by William Paterson on the 15th of June, the plan known then and ever since as the "New Jersey plan." This readiness of the members of the Convention to accept the resolution may, as Coxe properly enough infers, though without any definite evidence, have been stimulated by the news of the decision in North Carolina of the Bayard *vs.* Singleton case, the opinion of the court having been rendered in the latter part of May after the assembling of the Convention. It is to be noted, however, that just previous to the vote of the 17th of July accepting the resolution taken from the "Jersey plan," the delegation from North Carolina was the only one in the Convention to join the states of Virginia and Massachusetts in adhering to the scheme of the general negative on state laws.[1]

---

[1] Elliot, V. 322. An interesting phase of the gradual acceptance of the principle in the Convention appears in the attempt of Randolph, the sponsor for the Virginia Plan,

The words of the resolution as submitted by Paterson on the 15th of June are as follows: "Resolved, That all acts of the United States in Congress made by virtue and in pursuance of the powers hereby and by the articles of the confederation vested in them, and all treaties made and ratified under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the respective states, so far forth as those acts or treaties shall relate to said states, or their citizens; and that the judiciary of the several states shall be bound thereby in their decisions, anything in the respective laws of the individual states to the contrary notwithstanding." The origin of this paragraph is referred by Coxe to the letter and resolution of Congress which had been sent as a circular to the several states in the preceding April. This letter requested each state to pass an act, the form of which was inclosed, which would repeal all laws repugnant to the treaty of peace and should direct the state courts to hold that treaty as part of the law of the land, anything in the laws of the state to the contrary notwithstanding.

There were in the Convention several men who were sitting in the Congress when this circular letter and the form of repeal were adopted. Madison helped to frame it; Gorham and King of Massachusetts were also there; but from no one of these men came the suggestion of the resolution of the "New Jersey plan" which was proposed on the 15th of June and adopted by the Convention without a dissenting voice upon the 17th of July. The probability that the paragraph in the "New Jersey plan" was suggested by the proposal of Congress of March and April does not detract from the value of the services of those who incorporated it into the "New Jersey plan." The Congressmen in the Convention had not given it the "cold respect of a passing glance." The honor of a formal recognition and proposal of the principle of judicial nullification of unconstitutional law in our federal system must be ascribed to the authors of the "Jersey plan."

Coxe in the concluding portion of his work on *Judicial Power* maintains that the recognition of this principle as finally expressed in the sixth section of the second article of the completed Constitution cleared the way for and influenced the adoption in the Convention of the power in its full application by federal as well as by state courts. The sixth section of the second article is essentially the first part of the sixth resolution of the "New Jersey plan,"

to mediate, on July 10, between the large and small states. On that day he proposed for the states a power of appeal to the national judiciary against alleged unconstitutional use of the national legislative veto of state laws, and for individuals an appeal against the operation of a state law to the same tribunal, which "may adjudge such law to be void if found contrary to the principles of equity and justice." Elliot, V. 580.

modified in form of expression but unaltered in principle and unchanged in its purpose to give a judicial determination in case of conflict of the inferior with the superior law. This becomes more clearly apparent if the clauses in the "New Jersey plan" be examined which contemplated only one United States court, to which an appeal was authorized from the state courts, which by that plan, therefore, were made a portion of the federal system. The fact that the "New Jersey plan" proposed only an enlargement of the powers of general government rather than a radical change does not affect the validity of the reasoning which proves that that plan, by its recognition of an adequate scope for the exercise of this judicial function, essayed to provide a sure means of defence for the Union, a guaranty for its permanence.

The "Virginia plan" was accepted by the Convention as a basis for its work, while the "New Jersey plan," as a whole, was rejected, but the chief propositions of the former were one by one cast aside. Such were the proportional representation in both houses of Congress, the right of that body to negative state laws and the manner of choosing the executive. On the other hand some of the proposals of the "New Jersey plan" were embodied in the Constitution as finally adopted. Evidence is not wanting that the authors of the "New Jersey plan" intended that their work, while it embodied some fundamental principles, should serve in part, and for the time being, merely as a breakwater to give a new direction to the tide in the Convention which was hurrying to an extreme of nationalism and which threatened to sweep away some of the surest safeguards of a real and no less complete nationality. The express recognition of the judicial right to say to the inconsiderate or passionate use of the popular power "thus far and no farther," was a distinct contribution to the science and art of government and a boon to mankind. The representatives of other "small" states shared with the New Jersey delegates in the making of the plan which, however, no doubt with perfect propriety, bears the name of that state.[1] It seems highly probable that those delegates who had already adopted the principle of judicial supremacy in their own state should propose it for the Union, though it must be admitted that this assumption is warranted only by conjecture.

David Brearly, who was at this time still Chief Justice of New Jersey, was the one man in the Convention who as a judge had pronounced a law unconstitutional. William Paterson had been the secretary of the convention which framed the New Jersey constitution in 1776, and had been at the time of the suit of Holmes against Walton the attorney-general of the state. William Livingston, as governor, an office he still retained, had shared in the legislative acquiescence in the decision of the court and had, as we have seen, carefully considered the matter in suggesting reforms of the law which had been called in question by the court. Of all in the Convention it is safe to say that no man had been better trained than these three by the practical experience of a long labor over the question of the exercise of this highest judicial function. It was natural that these men should have urged its incorporation into the plan bearing the name of their state, which proposed a reform of "the federal constitution."[1]

---

[1] "Mr. Paterson observed to the Convention that it was the wish of several deputations, *particularly that of New Jersey*, to digest a plan purely federal." Elliot's *Debates*, V. 191.

Brearly was appointed by Washington, in the earliest months of his administration, in 1789, the first judge of the federal district court of New Jersey, but died next year at the early age of forty-five, too soon to have his due share in the larger national life. Livingston, having been annually chosen governor from 1776 to 1790, died in the latter year at an advanced age and was succeeded by Paterson who resigned the office of United States senator to accept that of governor of New Jersey. While in the Senate Paterson, as second to Ellsworth on the committee for organizing the judiciary, did his share in framing and supporting that memorable act establishing the federal judicial system. In 1793 Paterson was appointed by Washington a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. He died in 1806, having been on the bench as associate respectively of Jay, Ellsworth and Marshall.

The following summary expresses in brief the reasons for the view of the present writer that the case of Holmes *vs.* Walton is of considerable importance in our constitutional history:

1. It seems to take precedence in point of time of all similar decisions. The question of constitutionality was raised before the Supreme Court of New Jersey on the 11th of November, 1779, and decided on the 7th of September, 1780.

2. The question of constitutionality was brought squarely before the court and was squarely decided. Other questions and other principles were apparently not involved in the decision.

3. The judgment was not given *ad captandum*. It was clearly announced after long and careful consideration and evidently with a complete and intelligent view of its immediate, and in some degree

---

[1] The other deputies from New Jersey, William Churchill Houston and Jonathan Dayton, did not share at this time in the labors of the Convention. The former had gone home suffering from an illness which proved to be mortal, and the latter had not yet arrived.

of its far-reaching importance in the state at least. The evidence warrants the conclusion that the New Jersey judges desired to fix the scope of this power. They would leave intact all those portions of the law which were not plainly void.

4. The decision does not recognize "necessity" or extra-constitutional legislative war-powers or the special plea of patriotic motives in construing the organic law.

5. It is a happy circumstance that the decision guards one of the oldest and most important of constitutional rights, that of trial by a real jury.

6. The decision, though meeting with some opposition, was ratified by a legislature fresh from the people.

7. It had its influence outside of New Jersey, being cited in the appeal by Gouverneur Morris to the Pennsylvania legislature five years after it was rendered. This appeal was published in Philadelphia, then the central city of the Union, where Congress had had its sessions and where the Federal Convention two years later was to assemble.[1]

8. It must have had a value in preparing for the special duty of formally proposing the principle, Brearly the chief-justice, who rendered the decision, Paterson the attorney-general, and Livington the governor, the three Jerseymen who in the Federal Convention gave form and name and support to the "Jersey plan."

9. To the "New Jersey plan" is due the formal proposal and therefore, in large part, in due time and by due process, the final acceptance of this principle of judicial control in our legal system.

AUSTIN SCOTT.

---

[1] The decision in the case of Trevett *vs.* Weeden, in Rhode Island, 1786, and of Bayard *vs.* Singleton, in North Carolina, 1787, both involving more or less the constitutional right of a trial by jury, may have found some support in the New Jersey case of Holmes *vs.* Walton, of 1780. A desire to compliment the authors of those decisions by imputing to them the possession of information sufficient to include a knowledge of this case in a sister state would perhaps warrant such an assumption. Lack of historical proof alone prevents the present writer from showing this courtesy to their memory.

It may be proper, however, to add, by way of further conjecture, that Gen. James M. Varnum, who was the learned counsel in the case of Trevett *vs.* Weeden, and who afterwards published a pamphlet giving the history of the case, was a member of the Congress of 1780 and attended the sessions then held in Philadelphia. The case of Holmes *vs.* Walton which had just been decided and which was stirring the interest of the people of New Jersey could scarcely have failed to attract the attention of Varnum. Furthermore, a colleague of Varnum in the Congress of 1780 was William Churchill Houston, a delegate from New Jersey and in 1781 the clerk of its Supreme Court; but, so far as the present writer is concerned, anything beyond this circumstance is pure conjecture.

THE SEARCH FOR THE VENEZUELA-GUIANA BOUNDARY[1]

I HAVE been asked to tell something of the historical work of President Cleveland's Boundary Commission. Where the Guiana boundary is, or even where it ought to be, I shall not tell: first, because it would be unkind while the question is still *sub judice*; secondly, because nobody cares, now that Great Britain and Venezuela have agreed to leave it to a court; and, in the third place, because I never found out. Of the methods by which it was sought I know something and may freely speak.

When, just three years ago, President Cleveland's startling message had created—for most of us—the "Venezuelan Question," and a quintet of American jurists and scholars found themselves charged, at cost of peace or war, "to determine what is the true divisional line between the Republic of Venezuela and British Guiana," I suppose that many of us expected them to betake themselves bodily to the debatable ground. Some such notion would seem to have possessed the Yale men of Washington, who at the dinner they early gave to the members of the Commission (three of them alumni of Yale) presented each with a huge package of quinine and a bottle of Bourbon whiskey. But, if that mode of solution occurred to the Commissioners themselves, it was soon dispelled by something more than their fear of the shakes. For the mass of maps and descriptions with which they were forthwith flooded by the Library of Congress, to which they first appealed for help, showed that disputed region but a tangle of swamp and forest, with no paths save its rivers, and these as yet scarce threaded by any white man. Not a map of them all showed a sign of a line fence, and even Mr. Schomburgk's posts had, it was said, been long ago pulled up.

For a little there was hope, indeed, that light on the question might be gained from the maps themselves. But, though these agreed beautifully in making Venezuela yellow and British Guiana red, there was a most tantalizing want of harmony among them as to the meeting-point of these colors. For aid in their interpretation, the Commission called on the recognized leader of American historical geographers—here to be named only with bowed head—Professor Justin Winsor; but even he, after sifting two or three hundred of them, could only report that "this cartographical survey makes it clear . . . that there is, and that there can be, no 'true divisionary line,' in the sense of indubitable."

---

[1] This paper was read before the American Historical Association at its late meeting in New Haven.

Yet a "true divisional line" the Commission must find. Flouted by nature and baffled by the geographers, they could but take recourse to history. Was there not in the records some clue to a line unmarked by a survey and unpictured in the maps? Our Department of State had laid before the Commission a huge body of diplomatic correspondence, running back for more than half a century. But this only showed that throughout this period no claim had been made by either power, save under express protest by the other. And it appeared, by the repeated statement of each, that neither based its claims on title originally gained by itself, but on a cession of the rights of Spain or of Holland. Even that famous Schomburgk line, whose exemption from question had given rise to the trouble, proved on inquiry to rest, not on divine inspiration, but only on the alleged claims of the Dutch.

It was to the records, then, not of Venezuela and Great Britain, but of Spain and the Netherlands, that the Commission must turn for light. First of all, of course, there were the treaties. These happily were accessible in print, and were only three in number: that of Münster, in 1648, by which Spain first recognized the independence of the Dutch and their right to their colonies,—that of Utrecht, in 1713, which as to the Indies but confirmed the other,—and that of Aranjuez, in 1791, which was merely a cartel for the exchange of slaves. Only that of Münster, then, could seriously come into question as a source of claim. Alas, it admitted of the most diverse interpretation. Venezuela saw in it no warrant for further Dutch colonization in lands claimed by Spain, while Great Britain found in it an express permission to the Dutch "to make fresh acquisitions" of territory "wherever the Spaniards were not already established;" and the true meaning of this clause could not be determined with certainty from the treaty alone. It was at this point that the Commission turned for help to an historical student outside its own body; and it fell to me, for reasons which I can only hope the outcome may have revealed, to be called into its service.

My first task was the interpretation of the disputed clause. To ascertain the authorized language of the treaty, and to determine the precise words used in its official original and their force in the idiom of the time,—to learn from the circumstances of the time and the negotiations leading to the treaty what was in the thought of the parties,—to inquire into the general policy of each state as to unsettled lands in the Indies,—to find out if this clause of the treaty had ever been appealed to by either power, and, if so, in what sense,—to study the meaning put upon it by later diplomatists and historians: these were clearly the channels through which knowledge was to be sought. And, happily, even the proceedings of the negotiators and the instructions to the envoys were available in print,—those of the Dutch in the noble old work of Aitzema, those of the Spaniards in a lately published volume of the great national *Coleccion de Documentos Inéditos,* and the comments of their French colleagues in the *Négociations Secrètes* of Jean Leclerc. Not all these sources made possible a positive statement as to the meaning of the clause in question; but they at least made it very improbable that in the intent of the framers of the treaty it could have been so sweeping a concession as was claimed by its British interpreters.[1]

The treaties, then, did not help about the boundary. But it had been further urged by Great Britain that, long before these treaties, the Dutch Government had granted by charter to its West India Company the whole coast of Guiana, expressly naming the river Orinoco "as the limit of the Company's territorial jurisdiction," and that this limit had been repeatedly re-affirmed, both in the legislation of the States-General and in the grants made by the Company. This was important, if true; for a claim so notorious, if ignored by the treaties, might well go far to prove admitted ownership. But the legislation of the Dutch States-General, and even the grants of the Dutch West India Company, were for the most part also in print and accessible in American libraries; and it was a much easier task (though it cost a run to the libraries at the old Dutch capital of New Netherland) to learn of a surety that neither in any charter or act of the States-General nor in any published grant or legislation of the West India Company is there any mention of the Orinoco as a limit of territorial right, possession, or jurisdiction. It was, indeed, clear from these documents, that the whole coast of Guiana, from the Amazon to the Orinoco, was counted *open* to colonization by the Dutch; but so, alas, it was also by the French and the English, who from the beginning of the century had been likewise planting settlements on this coast and without the slightest protest from the Dutch—whom, indeed, they preceded in this quarter.[1]

---

[1] More than improbable I cannot even now deem it; and I must here most earnestly protest against a meaning given to my conclusions by sundry reviewers, Dutch as well as American, of the report of the Commission. I have been made to assert that the treaty of Münster *forbade* the Dutch further settlement in unsettled regions claimed by Spain. If the British interpretation seemed *improbable*, this seems to me *impossible*. As to unsettled regions, the treaty, in my opinion, simply shuts its eyes: agreement on this point between Spain and the Dutch, as between Spain and the other states of western Europe, was palpably impossible, and the treaty left the Dutch as to this on the same footing with the other powers and precisely where they were before. That nothing is said of this in my report is because that report had to do, not with the treaty as a whole, but only with one stipulated clause. Had I, however, supposed such a misunderstanding possible, I should certainly have guarded against it.

If errors so serious could be made in the interpretation of documents published and well known, how could the Commission rely on those which it knew only as laid before it by the contending parties? Documents of interest were constantly being cited from the Dutch or the Spanish archives, and claims of much importance supported by vague reference to these, sometimes without the quotation of the document even in extract or in translation. How could the Commission know that papers of moment were not misunderstood, or mistranslated, or even overlooked? Happily, as for Spain, where it might just then have been a delicate matter to ask favors for Americans, the government of Venezuela offered to lay before the Commission the transcripts, made and officially certified by the Spanish archivists themselves, of all the documents which could be found bearing upon the question at issue; and on the correctness and the completeness of these there was a further check in the blue-books of the British government, in which the same documents, supplied from the same source, were being laid before the British public and incidentally before the Commission. At Rome, too, whence such evidence was hoped from the archives of the Propaganda and of the Capuchin order as to the Spanish missions in Guiana, there was reason to believe that through the courtesy of the ecclesiastical authorities, with whom the Commission was in correspondence, all that could be found would be furnished in certified form without the intervention of an agent. But from the records in Holland, whose testimony might be all-important as to those facts of occupation on which British claims were chiefly based, next to nothing had been printed even in translation: nor could it be learned that research was there going on.

---

[1] And let me here take occasion to say a word upon a point raised by the keen-eyed but generous critic who reviewed the Commission's report for the *American Historical Review*. "The general course and tone," he thinks, of the work done for the Commission, "run much as a hostile criticism of the British case." I think there is truth in this; but the explanation is simple. The British claims, which based themselves chiefly on facts of occupation, dealt in definite historical statements, demanding critical discussion. Venezuela, claiming by prior discovery, was content, as to these, to throw on her antagonist much of the burden of proof, and her sweeping denials neither needed nor permitted such criticism; but, had the reviewer been as familiar with Venezuelan claims as with British ones, it is possible he might have found them no less fully answered. And, had the Commission's work not been interrupted before the Spanish evidence could be submitted to as thorough a sifting as the Dutch, it would perhaps have appeared that the only hostility was toward reckless statement. If those who served the Commission were sympathizers with either party to the controversy, I do not know it. But that is neither here nor there. It was not a question of sympathy: it was a question of historical fact.

On the other hand, the work of the Commission among the great body of printed histories, travels, descriptions, which professed to give the facts as to the discovery and settlement of Guiana made it growingly conscious that here, too, there must be analysis and sifting by a trained investigator before anything could be taken as a basis for its own conclusions. To meet this double need, the Commission now called in further to its aid Professor Jameson, of Brown University, whose admirable monograph on the founder of the Dutch West India Company showed his pre-eminent fitness for dealing with the problems in hand. After looking over the field together, it seemed wise that he should investigate in American libraries the history of Spanish and Dutch settlements in Guiana prior to 1648 (the date of the treaty of Münster) while I was sent across the sea to explore the Dutch archives. His task was first completed, and his searching criticism vastly cleared the ground for the Commission by discarding a multitude of loose statements, both Spanish and Dutch, as to the beginnings of settlement in Guiana.

My own researches began at the Hague, where, of course, in the archives of the realm, was to be sought the diplomatic correspondence between Holland and Spain—those despatches of the Dutch ambassadors at Madrid to the States-General, to their secretary, and to the Pensionary of Holland, and those instructions issued in return by these to the ambassadors, wherein one might at any moment light on claim or protest as to Guiana. There, too, were of course the minutes of the States-General's own proceedings, to be skimmed for permissions to voyagers, for grants to colonists, for charters to traders; there the records of the Dutch admiralties, with their rulings as to ships in every sea; there the log-books of Dutch men-of-war, a vast collection, testifying much as to the Guiana coats; there the huge tomes of negotiations and debates leading to the treaties of Münster and Utrecht—proving, happily, to hold little of moment not already printed. There, too, most important of all, I found, to my surprise and great joy, gathered now under this one roof of the national archives, the entire body of those papers of the Dutch West India Company for which, half a century ago, Brodhead, on the errand of the state of New York, had to ransack all Holland. And whereas, to Brodhead's grief, the papers of the Amsterdam Chamber, the body controlling New Netherland, had in large part been sold or burnt, those of the Zeeland Chamber, under whose control were the Guiana colonies, proved almost absolutely intact. It was, indeed, their abundance which appalled. Of these thousands of thick volumes of manuscript, some hundreds at least, as was evident from the catalogue, must be thoroughly searched: reports and letters from Guiana and answering orders from its rulers, deliberations of the Company's chambers, prospectuses and grants, contracts and commissions, accounts without end of the Company's colonial farms, valuable in evidence of occupancy, pay-rolls and muster-rolls of the Company's servants, testifying to the location, date, duration, equipment, of those frontier trading-posts on whose site and character turn so much of British claim, journals of the colonial administration, transactions of the colonial courts, maps by the colonial surveyors.

From all these evidence had to be gleaned, transcribed, Englished; and despite the valued help that came to me in July through the coming of Dr. De Haan, of Johns Hopkins University, a careful scholar, Dutchman by birth and Spaniard by *Fach*, to whose hands I could safely entrust the task of collation and translation, weeks had grown to months before I could bring my investigations to a close. These had meanwhile led me from the Hague to Zeeland in the vain hope of there finding more in the municipal records, and thence across the North Sea to London, whither, not more to my surprise than to that of the Dutch archivists, a great part of the eighteenth-century records of the Essequibo colony were found to have drifted. It was past mid-October, notwithstanding all diligence, before I could sail for home with my transcripts.

Meanwhile, good work had been doing on this side of the sea. While the keen and tireless geographer of the Commission, Mr. Marcus Baker, had been shaping from the chaos of journals and reports a body of reliable data as to the natural features of the region in controversy, and directing the making of a map which should embody his results, its versatile secretary, Mr. Mallet-Prevost, was busy among the great map collections of our eastern cities in the almost hopeless pursuit of sources of suggestion and lines of dependence which should explain the contradictory boundaries of the map-makers.

If, in this survey of the work done *for* the Commission, I have seemed to lose sight of the work done *by* the Commission, it is only because for reasons of state, whose nature is evident, the work done *by* the Commission never saw the light. To prescribe, to direct, to keep abreast of all these lines of research, to correlate their results, and to determine the principles of law which should govern their application to the question at issue, meanwhile maintaining a check upon the work of their lieutenants by dipping independently into all the more important sources, was a task to consume the leisure of far less busy men; and none need doubt the sense of grateful relief with which they hailed the tidings that the responsibility of a verdict had been transferred to other shoulders. How far the Commission would have adopted the results of its experts, or what conclusions they would have based upon them, is of course beyond the reach of conjecture.

What, then, did it all amount to? The American Commission, in its report, uttered the hope that its labors might be of value to the Arbitral Tribunal. I dare to trust that they have had an earlier use. Even while we were at work, a great change came over the attitude of both Great Britain and Venezuela to the matter at issue. From the point of view of the trained student it would be hard to conceive a contrast more striking than that of the second to the first of the blue-books in which the British Government set forth and established its claim. Rash statements of fact were quietly retired, asertions of right were modified, documents were given in full, with exact statement of their whereabouts, and even sometimes in the original tongue. Venezuela's indignant and sweeping denials gave place in later utterances to more definite and persuasive statement. And long before our work was published both countries had arrived, by independent research of their own, at more than one of our results. It may be that we only gave them the time to do this work. Yet, as I have turned over in the past months the pages of the Case and the Counter-Case submitted by each country to the Arbitral Tribunal, and have noted how, in spite of much additional evidence, both of document and map, the statement of historical fact laid down by each agrees at nearly all points with the results reached for the American Commission, and further how, as to this basis of historical fact, however divergent the claims based upon it, there is now substantial agreement between the contestants, so that their issue is now in the main one of law, not of fact, I have taken pleasure in the belief that already our work has proved of service.

We shall soon know the verdict of the final tribunal. Case and Counter-Case are in. The printed briefs have been submitted. The oral arguments will be heard in May. Before midsummer we shall doubtless know the result.

Whatever that result may be—whether or no our labors may have aided to add a few more miles of swamp or of forest to the territory of Great Britain or of Venezuela—I cannot believe that those labors are lost. Nay, even though errors of detail be detected in our work, if that work as a whole shall be found the work of scholars and true men—work generous in scope, scientific in method, fair in spirit—I believe there must come out of it something better than the ownership of swamp or of forest, of gold mines or mouths of rivers. I believe that the world will be slow to forget that there has been found for an aggrieved nation, even when its demand for arbitration has been refused, a way to deal with a question of historical claim more effective than an immediate appeal to arms. And if, to the sober eye of retrospective history, it shall appear that in this instance the foremost of civilized states was on the point of being drawn into desperate war with two transatlantic neighbors over a claim which had no better objective basis than a German adventurer's misreading of an Indian name, I much doubt if any civilized state will so soon again be willing to risk the derision of posterity by refusing all peaceful arbitration until it has at least set its own scholars at one earnest effort to test the justice of its cause.

George Lincoln Burr.

DOCUMENTS

1. *The Siege of Charleston; Journal of Captain Peter Russell, December 25, 1779, to May 2, 1780.*

Captain Peter Russell, "a remote scion of the Bedford Russells," was born near Cork. From a letter addressed to the Duke of Portland in April, 1799, we learn that he attended the University of Cambridge. Entering the army, on August 18, 1778, he received his commission of captain in the 64th Regiment and was with the expedition sent against Savannah and Charleston in 1779–1780, during which he seems to have kept the following journal. Nothing appears to be known of his career after the termination of the war until his emigration to the newly-formed province of Upper Canada in 1792. Governor Simcoe appointed him a member of the Executive Council, and on Simcoe's return to England, in 1796, he became administrator of the province with the title of President. This position he held until the arrival of General Hunter, in August, 1799. His name is usually associated with the circumstance of the numerous grants of land made by the administrator to the individual. As executive councillor he was entitled to 6000 acres, which he preferred to take in small quantities in different portions of the country. He afterwards filled the position of receiver-general and died at York (Toronto) September 30, 1808. His papers, with all his property, passed into the hands of his sister, Miss Elizabeth Russell, who bequeathed them to Dr. William Warren Baldwin, a young doctor from the same district in the South of Ireland from which she and her brother had emigrated. In his custody and that of his son, the Hon. Robert Baldwin, attorney-general, they remained until the death of the latter in 1858. Shortly after they were burned, with the exception of the longer documents, which were deposited with the Baldwin papers. The executors of the Baldwin estate retained these in safe custody until 1898, when they were deposited in the Public Library, Toronto. The little volume ends abruptly, and so far no continuation has been discovered. As it is marked No. 3, it is evidently one of a series, the earlier parts of which may yet be found.

James Bain, Jr.

December 25th 1779 Embarked at N York in the John, a Horse Transport, with the Commander in Chief, Sir H. Clinton, and his family consisting of Major Crosby, Major Willmousky,[1] Captains Hanger,[2] St George, and Keppel and Lt Colo Watson, Aides de Camp, and Captains Philips and Russell Asst Secretaries. Fell down the same day to the Hook, where the Commander in Chief, Major Crosby and Major Andre[3] left us and embarked in the Romulus Man of War.

Decr 26th. The whole Fleet, consisting of the Europe, V. Admiral Arbuthnot, Russell Commodore Drake,[4] Robuste, Raisonable and Defiance Line of Battle, Renown 50, Roebuck and Romulus 44s, Perseus and Camilla Frigates, Anna Theresa Packet, 57 Transports 3 Ordnance and 3 Engineer Ships, 3 Navy and 7 Army Victualers, and 13 Small Craft with Horses, having on board 1st and 2d Battn of Light Infantry and 1st and 2d Battn of

	Men
Grenadiers, both	2000
4 Battalions Hessian Grenadiers	1600
7th Foot	2000
23. do	
33d do	
63d do	
64th do	
Artillery	146
17th Light Dragoons	50
Huynes Regiment of Hessians	500
Detachment of 71st	150
Yagers	250
Legion mounted and dismounted	400
Fergusons and Hangers Riflemen	350
Guides and Pioniers	120
Total	7584

Generals
Sir H. Clinton, Commander in Chief
Earl Cornwallis, Lieut General
Brigr Genl Patterson
Major General Huyn[5]
Major General Kospoth.[5]

Sailed from the Hook about one oclock with a fair wind for the Southward.

---

[1] Emanuel de Willmousky, major of the Regiment Mirbach, major of brigade in the Hessian corps. [Mr. Bain is not responsible for the annotation of the documents.]

[2] Afterward Lord Coleraine.

[3] The celebrated Major John Andre.

[4] Afterward Rear-Admiral Sir Francis Samuel Drake.

[5] Of the Hessian corps.

[The entries for the next thirty-three days, relating to the voyage and the storms encountered, are omitted.]

Jany. 29th. The Wind came about to the N. E. in the Night, which carried us 7 Knots, fine weather and smooth Sea. in Lat. 32.41 by obs. 60 Sail in Sight The admiral at Noon Shaped his Course for Tybee. Course S. W. by S. Land in Sight on the Starboard Beam. Joined to-day by the Roebuck, Renown, and Blonde. Received Intelligence from the Romulus which She received from a Privateer that 800 Men had been taken Prisoners by the Spaniards in Pensacola.[1] They were commanded by Lieut. Col. Dickson of the 16th. Also that the Raleigh and Richmond were arrived on the Coast in their way to New York; who bring an acct. that the British Fleet were drove into Port[2] by the combined Fleets and that a Rebel of the Name of Jones had taken one of our 40 Gun Ships[3] and carried her into the Texel. The Admiral brought to with the fleet at 10 at Night, being afraid of running too far in.

Jany 30. Calm in the Morning but the Wind afterward sprung up from the West. Two Men of War, The Foy and an armed Ship called the Germain, came into the feet today. In Lat. 31.51 Received Intelligence that the Rebels have twelve Sail of strong armed Ships and a considerable Body of Troops at Charles Town. Lord Cornwallis landed at Savannah from the Roebuck, who chased a 32 Gun Ship a Shore yesterday, but she got off again. The Renown, Roebuck and Blonde left the fleet this morning to cruise off Charles Town. 61 Sail in Sight. about 9 Leagues off Tybee at noon. at 5 in the Evening the Admiral made the Signal for the fleet to Anchor, but at half after Nine he tacked without Signal which our Ship observed and did the Same, by which we got separated from the rest of the fleet.

Jany. 31st Wind N. N. W. At ten in the Morng light airs and foggy and no Ships in Sight. About noon we saw the Light House of Tybee bearing N. N. W. of us two leagues distant and discovered Several of the fleet to leeward thro the Fog. having no Pilot we are obliged to stand off and on. The Fog continuing we came to an Anchor at 4 in the Afternoon near the Perseus about two leagues N. W. of the Light House. Capt. Elphinston,[4] Ld. Thomas Clinton &c paid us a Visit to day and informed us that 13 of the Missing Ships were arrived; including Russell, Roebuck, Raisonable, and Renown. The Crews of the Russell and Roebuck very sickly. The Troops at Savannah in high health; and 300 Men sent to reinforce the Garrison at St. Augustine. Col. Dickson was taken at the Natchez. That the Frigates at Chas. Town wish to make their Escape but part of our Fleet are ordered to anchor on the Bar and remain until drove off by bad weather. and the large Ships are to water at Beaufort. Capt. Elphinston gave us a loaf of Sugar.

Feby. 1st. At half after ten in the Morning we weighed with a few more transports in comp^{y} with the Perseus, but the Fog is so thick we cannot see the light House. However by following the Perseus we had the good fortune to get to an Anchor within the Light House at half after 4 in the afternoon. We here found the Vigilant and Several Transports. The Course in is to keep the Light House West and by South and not to shallow your water above three fathom. We were here informed that the Judith Transport foundered on her Voyage and with difficulty the Peoples lives and twenty of the Pontoons were Saved by the Raisonable. Admiral hoisted his flag in the Roebuck

---

[1] Read "Baton Rouge." *Remembrancer*, 1780, I. 359–365.

[2] An exaggeration.

[3] The *Serapis*.

[4] Afterward Admiral Lord Keith.

List of Missing Ships.

Elizabeth and Martha	Victualler
Smyrna Galley	Grenadiers
Lord Mulgrave	63^{d}
King George	64th
Fathers Desire	Victualler
Fidelity	Legion
Elenor	D^{o} Cavalry
Ann[1]	Hangers [?] Corps.
Littledale	Q^{r} M. G. Depart
Russian Merch^{n}	Ordnance D^{o}.
Grey Hound	1 com^{y} 63 and Gen^{l} Pattersons Baggage
Remembrancer	Engineer Departm^{t} Cap^{t} Dunford.

on the 5th of Jan^{y} The Columbus Rebel Privateer of 20 Guns from Charles Town took the Juno Horse Sloop in the Midst of the fleet, cut the Horses Throats, and after taking Cap^{t} James of the Legion out,[2] and making the eleven Men of his Troop give their Parole let the Sloop proceed on her Voyage.

Feb^{y} 2^{d}. Remain at anchor. [illegible]er mild but very Foggy. A great many of the Transports with th[illegible]uck and Romulus came up with the Mornings Tide. The Is[illegible]ee has a miserable appearance, being a Bank of Sand w[illegible] and no Water. The watering Place is five fathom Hole [illegible]n the light House. The General went up to Savannah to [illegible]ulus's Barge. Our last Morcel of fresh Provis[illegible]t Whitaker up to Major Crosbie t[illegible]ock. Terrible accounts from [illegible]es of every thing.

[illegible]der in Chief, Cap^{t} Philips [illegible]d half in rowing up. It [illegible]nnels. We passed by [illegible]the River, to which [illegible]bell in the Evening and were immediately conducted to Mr. Paumiers, the Commissary General,[1] where we lodged and were treated with the utmost Kindness and Hospitality. Mr. McCullogh the Collector was also very Civil to us.

Feby. 4th. Remain at Savannah, which we find to be a very disagreeable Sandy Bluff looking over an extensive flat of Rice Grounds. The Houses lie Scattered, and are poorly built mostly of wood—in Short the whole has a most wretched miserable appearance. In Orders as Asst. Secrety.

Feby. 5th. Remain. Entered upon General Prevosts accts.[2] It is reported that the Remembrancer has got into Providence. took a Peep at the Works on the Ebenezer Road; the Ditch of the Lines easily to be leapt over, the Abbatis trifling, and the right of the Works may be doubled without Difficulty. Astonishg. how they were defended! I wish we may find no better Works at Charles Town.

Feby. 6th. Settled the Indian Business both of Col. Brown[3] and Mr. Shaw. Genl. Prevost to inspect their Accts. and pay such as he approves of. Impossible to enter into the whole of Genl. Prevosts accts. got an abstract from him of the Sums wanting to pay the Subsistence of the Army and the Contingencies amounting to little more than £11,000 Mr. Paumier has got a Warrant for £5000 Ld. Cathcart[4] to pay the Bat. and Forage of the Southern Army £8500 and £10000 more will be wanted for the Provincials. Sent away the Baggage.

Feby. 7th. The Commander in Chief sent for me and after asking me some Questions relative to Mr. Elliots Papers, His Excelly. had the Goodness to express a strong desire to serve Capt. Philips and myself and desired we would consult together and point out to him some Place which we might hold conjointly without in[illegible]erfering with the business under our Charge. Consulted accordingly—[illegible] wrote a Letter in Consequence to his Excelly. which I am to delive[illegible]me favorable opportunity. The weather so bad, we could not go [illegible]

Feby. 8th. Blows hard at N[illegible]ommander in Chief set off about ½ After 8 oclock in th[illegible]d Philips, Col. Watson, Major Despard,[5] Capt. St. George a[illegible] off at Nine in Mr. McCulloghs Boat—arrived on board the[illegible]Clock. We came thro the Cockspur Channel with flood[illegible]ssage. We had the Pleasure to find that th[illegible] arrived but no News of the [illegible] cancelled.

---

[1] Peter Paumier, deputy [illegible]

[2] Major-General Augus[illegible] against the Americans.

[3] Pres[illegible]

Feby 9th. Commander in Chief, Majors Crosby and André, came on board and the whole fleet got under way at ½ after 12 oclock Noon. a Very fine day. Wind at West. The Russell and Europe joined the fleet. The Perseus got on ground coming over the Bar. The Fleet came to an Anchor at half after four in the Evening about 4 leagues East of Tybee. We left at Savannah Lt Colo Fergusons Corps of Riflemen[1] and Brig. Genl Patterson, who are to be joined by one Battalion of 71st the light Infantry of the Georgian Army, some Provincial Corps and Indians, and the Legion for some particular Service. One Battalion of the 71st is to join this Army. The Vigilant, Gallies and some empty Transports are gone by the inland Navigation to Beaufort. Gave the Commandr in Chief a Summary View of Mr Elliots Papers and a List of such Appointments as may be requisite for him to constitute on his getting Possession of Charles Town. The Part of the Legion which are arrived were landed at Savannah and the rest to join General Patterson as they arrive.

Feby 10th The fleet got under Way at half after nine oclock in the Morng The Perseus got afloat and followed us. The King George, a Missing Transport having three Companies of 64th under Major McLeroth, joined us this Evening to our great Satisfaction.

February 11th Came to an anchor at one in the morng Weighed, again, at seven in the morning, with the whole Fleet. Captain Moncrief[2] came on board at 8 oclock and Captain Elphinstone and a Pilot at half after ten. One of our Cruisers appeared to Windward, but we do not know her name. The John led the fleet, consisting of 55 Sail, into North Edisto, where we came to an Anchor about ½ a league from Symmonds Island opposite to a Creek at 12 oclock. Lord Cornwallis, the Admiral &c came on board, and a Disposition was immediately made for landing the Troops. The Army brigaded: British Grenadiers and Light Infantry under Major General Leslie[3] Hessian Grenadiers under Major General Kospoth. These two Brigades under Lord Cornwallis. The 7th 23d 63d 64th 33d 71st Yagers and Regiment of Hyn—under Lt Colo Clark,[4] Lt Colo Webster[5] and Major General Huyn, who has also the Command of this latter Division. Part of the British Grenadiers and light Infantry landed at Six in the Evening. The Commander in Chief with all his Suit except Capt Philips Major Willmousky and myself landed along with them. a rainy Evening. The Harbour of North Edisto lies land locked between Symonds and Tuckers Islands opposite a Creek which leads to a Bridge communicating with St Johns Island—only 15 feet over the

---

[1] Lieut. Col. Patrick Ferguson of the 71st Highlanders, killed at King's Mountain in October.

[2] Captain James Moncrieff of the Royal Engineers, who had charge of the works at Savannah and at Charleston.

[3] Major-General the Hon. Alexander Leslie.

[4] Alured Clarke, lieutenant-colonel of the Seventh Fusileers; afterward conqueror of the Cape of Good Hope, commander-in-chief in India, and field-marshal.

[5] Lieut. Col. James Webster of the 33d Foot, mortally wounded the next year at Guilford Court House.

Bar. The Harbor very secure about a mile from land to land and good anchorage of 7 fathom. The Roebuck and Perseus did not attempt to come in. The General requires that Philips and I shall take it by Turns to remain in the Ship with the Papers and Money. A Gale of Wind came on this Evening from the North East accompanied with Rain—so that it was lucky we got in as we did. Some of the Troops lost their way in the woods and the Gen^l lay under a Tree in the Rain.

Feb^y 12th The Remainder of the Army and Cavalry landed in the Morning. Wind the same, with a thick Fog and Rain. Cap^t Philips went up in the Whale Boat to Simmonds House with a Bed, Trunk and Canteens belonging to the General. Some more of the Troops lost their Way, tho it was not above three Miles to Symonds House Light Infantry moved to Wilson's House and took post.

Feb^y 13th Wind in the same Quarter but no Rain. Sent up Whitaker and Generals Servants with Liquors Cooking utensils, &c. Two Ships appear in the offing. Six days Provisions for the Army sent to Symmonds House also the Waggons of British Regiments and two three Pounders. Rec^d Information from two Inhabitants, White and Remmington, that there are 500 Horses, 2000 Horned Cattle and 20000 Sheep on Edisto Island—That the Lively and Ariel are escaped from Charles Town —the Queen of France, Ranger Boston and Confederacy, with two French Frigates remain there,—also that 15 Sail of West India Men had arrived since our fleet appeared off the Coast. A Rebel Continental or Militia Captain taken to day. The General employed reconnoitring S^t Johns Island and the Stono Entrance. Cap^t Elphinstone went off after Nine at Night to examine the Cut between Key Waw and Symonds Islands. Rained in the night Light Infantry took post one Battalion at Chishoms, the other at Fenwicks

Feb^y 14th Sent the Generals black Box by Cap^t Philips. he took up also a Bag of Gold marked 1002 G^s Cap^t Elphinstone returned. A number of the Inhabitants of Edisto Island came to solicit Protection—ordered them to collect the Government Horses and bring them to the landing Wind South East. no Rain Yagers and 33 took post at Stono Ferry.[1]

Feb^y 15th Captain Elphinstone went with the flat Boats by the Upper Navigation to Stono Ferry where the army was to meet him. The Scourge Galley accompanied him. Gen^l Leslie arrived in the Packet in 5 days from Tybee, where the Smyrna Galley had arrived under Convoy of a Privateer. The Smyrna Galley parted with the Defiance and Six Ships the 8th Inst. She also reports that the Russia Merch^n an Artillery Ship foundered, and ninety of the People Saved. The other Artillery Vessel had been taken by a Rebel Privateer, and 12 Artillery Men taken out, but the Vessel afterwards retaken by the Defiance. Cap^t M^{c}Kinnon D. Q. M. General received from Edisto Island eight of the Kings Horses. Wind South West and afterwards South East, Rained the greatest part of the day. Army remained in their Encampment.

[1] See Eelking, tr. Stone, pp. 177, 178.

Feby 16th Delivered from Edisto eight Horses to a Hessian Serjeant at the landing on Simonds Island, and two more to Serjeant Joel Symond of the Qr M. General Department Landed at Daniel Jenkins House on Edisto and brought off three Horses from thence and some Indian Corn. A Schooner arrived from Tybee. The Defiance was arrived there with 5 Sail of Vessels. A very fine day Light Infantry crossed over to Stono, as also 7th 33d and Yagers and 23d. General Leslie takes the Command there

Feby 17th. Wind N. East. The Roebuck Raisonable and Blonde in the offing. The Admiral in the Roebuck came to an anchor off the Harbour. An Officer arrived from him with a Sloop from Providence with 115 Rebel Prisoners permitted to go from thence on their Parole to any part of America promising to send off as many British in Exchange. The Blonde saw the Light House of Charles Town blown up by the Rebels. The Admiral fell in with a Transport having on board some Recruits for the Army which came out with the Iris and another Man of War. She is sent into Tybee, and the Raleigh has been since seen off that Harbour. Captain Elphinstone returned about two this Morning, having effected his Passage through Wadmalaw with the flat Boats to Stono. The 1st Battalion Light Infantry, 7th 23, and 33d Regts with the Jagers passed the ferry yesterday and took Possession of Col. Maitlands[1] works under the Command of Major General Leslie while the rest of the army except two Battalions moved to Gibs's under Lord Cornwallis. The Commander in Chief removes to Fenwicks today Five Artillery and Baggage Ships Sailed up to Wadmalaw this afternoon, and the flat and long Boats of the fleet go up this Evening with 8 Days Provision for the Army The Gun Boat and a flat Boat also effected their passage yesterday by Key Waw and up Stono to the ferry without opposition. Sent four more Horses to the Army, the Hessian Guard at the landing having given a Recipe for them. Guard removed from thence this Night Position of the Army 1st Batt. L. I., Jagers, 33d 7th and 23d on the Main Side of Stono ferry. 2d L. I. at Chisholms House. 1st Grenrs at Fenwicks 2d Grs at Gibbs. Hessn do at Wells's. 63 and 64th at Wilsons, and Huynes Regt at Simmonds Bridge

Feby 18. The Briton arrived here with Col. Innes Capt Robinson and Mr Simsons and Lord Cornwallis's Horses. Ten of the Horses on board were killed on the Voyage thro Necessity received confirmation of the Russia Mercht an Ordnance Ship having foundered the people on board saved by the Lord Dunmore Privateer and carried to Bermudas. Captain Philips carried up the Chest of Money under my charge, got a return of the 63 Convalescents in the different Ships Sent up more stationary by Capt Philips. A Canoe with a Pilot and six hands dispatched to Night thro the inland Navigation to St Helena Sound to look after the Gallies expected from Beaufort. Received several complts today from the Inhabitants of Edisto of the Sailors plundering their Houses and killing and taking away their Cattle I communicated them to the Adjut. Genl. for the Commander in Chiefs Information. Received a Letter from Major André, desiring my Opinion of the Number of Cattle and Horses which the Islands of Edisto and Tucker were capable of Supplying, and that the General was not desirous of granting Protections to the Inhabitants, until they gave something more than Negative Proofs of their attachment to Government. fair Weather Army in same Position.

---

[1] Hon. Alexander Maitland, colonel of the 49th Foot.

Feby 19th Wind North East, hard Gales and Rainy. The Vindictive Galley arrived thro' the Cuts—brings an Acct of the Snake Galley of one Nine Pounder being blown up in the Passage hither by Accident. One Gunners mate and a woman lost by this accidt the rest of the Crew being on Shore. Captain Elphinstone went up again to Stono. Overhauled the Secretary's Boxes, and discovered that the Duplicates of last Dispatches are left behind. I have them therefore to prepare over again.

Feby 20th One Galley and three Schooners came thro' the Cuts and were sent off upon Some Duty. I went on Shore and brought off four horses, one of which I kept the rest I sent by Fredk Williams of the Carolinians to Major Hay with a Letter. two Negroes, Bristol and Harry accompanied him. Ld Cornwallis's Horses landed. wrote by the Dragoon to Capt Philips. Wind N. W. a fine day Galley anchored to day in Wappoo Cut. Huynes Regimt took post near Wells's. 1st L. I. recrossed Stono and took Post near the Ferry. 2d L. I. to Fenwicks

Feby 21st Hard Gales of Wind from N. E. with heavy Rain. Accounts came from Tybee that the Raleigh, Smyrna Galley Fidelity, Elinor, Greyhound, Elizabeth and Martha, Charming Polly, Genl Pattison and Littledale are arrived there and that the Defiance having struck on the North Breakers in attempting to go in has stranded and got 9 feet Water in her hold, and it is expected will be lost. Received a Letter from the General to order the Packet immediately over the Bar and join the Admiral—which I have done but the Weather is so bad the Pilot will not venture to take charge of her. Capt Tonkin went to the John and Jeane. Mr Winter went up to the Army with Provisions. 1st and 2d at Fenwicks, where 1st L. I. took Post.

Feby 22d Wind S. E. blows hard and rains. Bot of Mr Putnam for the General a firkin of Butter and Box of Candles £11.17 for which I gave my Receipt to be returned when the Money is paid. The Perseus with 18 Sail from Tybee appeared off the Harbour about 5 in the afternoon, but a violent Gale of Wind coming on from the N. West they were blown off again. About Seven Capt Pike brought me a Letter from André to tell me the General requested that I would muster with the assistance of Capt Tonkin a Sufficient Party to bring off John Short from Key Waw Island and send him to Head Quarters. Army as yesterday.

Feby 23d I accordingly set off at half after nine in the morning with 2 sergts and 16 Privates in a flat Boat to Simmons's with an Intention of passing the overhaul at high Water and going down Key Waw River with the Ebb, but the strong Westerly Winds had blown the Water so much out of the Cut that I could not pass with the Boats, and when I attempted to go to the ford by land, I found the Waters so out that it was impracticable to get to the Island that way, I therefore gave up the Matter and brought back my Party to the Beach, leaving the Boat to return the next Tide. A most violent Hurricane the greater part of the day, which drove several of the Transports foul of each other and some of them on Shore, but no material Injury was done to any. 300 L. I. embarked in the Galley.

Feby 24th. Blew strong in the Morning from N. W. but moderated towards Evening. The Packet sailed over the bar to join the Admiral. An Orderly Dragoon brought me Dispatches from the General, who desires I will keep his English Dispatches, which are coming by the Perseus, until I see him. A Battalion of light Infantry and another of Grenadiers pushed over to James Island today, and also the heavy Artillery, a Serjt and 12 of the Pioneers surprised at Stono by the Enemy's Light Horse. Light Infantry landed at Perinos House. B. Gs crossed at Matthews and landed at Hamilton.

Feby 25th. Wind N. E. a fine day. Head Qrs at Perinos Captain Hanger came down from the General to take up his Dispatches brought no letter to me. Sent a Serjt and 4 Men by Simon's Inlet to Key Waw in quest of Short. Could not hear of any Such person, but found some Salt Works on Middletons Plantation having 50 or 60 Bushels of ready made Salt—informed the Commander in Chief of it, and spoke to Tonkin to send a Boat to bring it off. One Schooner and three Sloops with horses for the Artillery and Q. M. G Department arrived this afternoon between 20 and 30 of them thrown overboard in the last severe Gale. B. Grs took post at the Bridge on the New Cut. Hessn Grs crossed at Mathews and took post at Hamiltons.

Feby 26th. South West, fine Weather. Received a Letter from the Admiral for the Commander in Chief. Explored Tuckers Island, found it without Inhabitants, and saw no living animals there. Some convalescents brought from the Roebuck under a Surgeons Man of the name of Hart. sent them to Jenkins House on Edisto. Directed the Inhabitants of the Island to supply them with fresh Provisions for Payment at a reasonable price. Informed that the fleet were seen in the Offing to the Northward, and that the Admiral intended to conduct them into Stono. Army remains as yesterday.

Feby 27th. Hessn Grs marched to Fort Johnson. Huynes Regt crossed to Matthews and the 64th took Ground of Hessn Grs. The Fathers Desire, a large Army Victualler, got on ground on the N. Breakers but by the Vigilance of Capt Tonkin in lightening her she got off again and was brought in. informed by Sir Wm Twisden[1] that General Robertson[2] is gone into Stono with the Commander in Chiefs Dispatches. he came in the Romulus. The Æolus and fame with 8 Companies of 71st are missing. they had but 4 days Provisions and Water when they sailed from Tybee and have been out seven days. The Rosey, an Ordnance Brig, is likewise missing. Dined on board Mr Townsend.[1] Good Weather. Capt Hanger returned. The Remembrancer came in to day.

---

[1] A lieutenant in the Royal Fusileers.

[2] Colonel of the 16th Regiment.

Feby 28th Capt Elphinstone came down from the army. The Grenadiers and light Infantry with the Commander in Chief took Possession of James Island yesterday without opposition. Whitaker came down to day. Sent a Qr Cask of Madeira drawn from the Pipe by him, with some fruit from Providence[2] and Stationary for Capt Philips. The Butter and Candles returned to Mr Putnam. A man belonging to the Betsy and Pollys boat killed in her by the Rebels near Stono, and the Gun Boat fired two or three rounds of Grape at about 50 of them hid in the Marsh. They burnt the Andrews long Boat. Two Companies of Grenadiers, one compy of 63d and another of the 71st landed from the Savannah Ships. Mr Winter came down to night with the long Boats. The Gun Boat and three flat Boats coming from Savannah with the Perseus, lost in the last bad weather. 2 Rebel Frigates and a French do Cannonaded the Hessn Grr Encampment.[3] 2 Hessns and 1 Artilyman wounded 7th and 23d and Jagers crossed Stono ferry. 100 men left on the Main in 2 Redoubts remainder of 71st landed on Johns Island and joined Colo Webster. A good day. Dined on board the John and Jean

Feby 29th Mr Winter returned to the army with the long boats loaded with the Hessian Waggons and Artillery. Wind N. E. brisk Gale 7th and 23d Regts crossed at Mathews landed at Hamiltons and took post near Hd Qrs Hessn Grs moved their Camp farther back out of the Cannonade.

March 1st Wind South blows hard and rains.

March 2d Wind N. W. fair day. Captain Elphinstone went round to Stono in the Breton having with him a number of Vessels of light draft loaded with the Engineers and Qr M. Generals Stores.. Lt Gilfinnan[4] landed his Waggons &c at Simmons. Comet Galley came from Beaufort after trifling away her time near three weeks. ordered to Stono

March 3d Wind Westerly, fresh Breese and fine day. Mr Winter returned w. the Boats. The John fell down the River, to proceed to sea to Morrow if we can get a Pilot. The Æolus, Fame Rosey &c. arrived Safe in Stono. They had been one day without Provisions and Water. The Defiance entirely lost, and none of her Stores saved except a few 18 Pounders. Comet did not Sail

March 4th Wind East and N. East, a fine day. Could not Stir the Wind being against us.. A Fire in Charles Town, and great Fire of small arms and beating of Drums.

March 5th Wind the same, a very fine day. 13 Sail of large Ships in Sight. The Galley went out and came to an anchor at the other Side the Bar. Took a walk as far as Simmons Inlet, near five Miles, over a

[1] Gregory Townshend, assistant commissary-general.

[2] New Providence (Nassau) in the Bahamas.

[3] See Eelking, tr. Stone, p. 178.

[4] Lieut. Thomas Gilfillan of Russell's own regiment was an assistant deputy quartermaster-general.

fine hard level Beach. Army waiting for intrenching Tools and Heavy Artillery.

March 6th. Little Wind, rained heavily great part of the Night and most of the Morng. 7th Regt crossed from Johns Island and landed on Coles Island. These last five days the Army employed in landing heavy Artillery &c. No part of the army had moved yesterday. The Comet returned into Port last night, which is very extraordinary as she could have got to Stono with great Ease. This Night 2 Batts of Lt Infantry crossed the Wappoo Bridge on Intelligence that some light Cavalry lay at Church Bridge.[1] The blow prevented by an officers Servant falling in with the Enemy and making a Discovery.

March 7th. Wind S. S. W. very hazy. Got under Way in the Morning with 18 Sail but the Weather proved too thick to proceed. we therefore all came back to our old Ground.

March 8th. Wind the same, a very fine day. We weighed in the Morning with the other Ships, but the Wind was too scant and we returned. Several very heavy Cannon heard today. The Galley sailed at last. explored Tuckers Island again, and found the Tracks of Horses, Cattle, Hogs and Goats, but saw nothing but one Hog and one Horse. A great deal of Rain in the Night. A Batt. of Grenrs marched this morng and met the light Infantry Commr in Chief took this Opportuny to reconnoitre the country. A Detachmt of 71st Regt crossed from Coles Island to L. H. Isld with 2 24 prs to enable the Admiral to lay Buoys on the Bar which the Rebel Gallies prevented. Remainder of 71st crossed to Light House Island.

March 9th. Wind the Same and very foggy in the Morning. did not attempt to go out. Caught a She Goat big with Kid on Tuckers Island, and saw three Horses there. a great deal of Rain in the Night. 4 Companies of Light Infy crossed the Wappoo and took post at St Andrews Bridge. The Agent alarmed by a report of the Rebels coming from the Main to Edisto Island in quest of Intelligence and with some evil Design agst the Transports. Major General Robinson left Hd Qrs for New York, goes in the Russell 33d and Jagers crossed to Hamiltons took Possession of the Bridge of New Cut. The post removed from Stono Ferry to day

March 10th. Wind S. W. a fine breese and fine day. Went out with the Morning's Tide in Company with 19 Sail and were about 4½ Hours running to our Distance off Stono, the opening bearing exactly N. W. which Course leads you clear of the Breakers. 11 feet over the Bar at dead low Water. Our fleet were at Anchor off the Harbour of Charles Town. saw some of the Rebel Vessels at anchor off the light House Island, and several Shots fired from them and our Ships. Weighed again at four in the Afternoon, and got all safe in between John and James Islands at half after Seven. A Battalion of 71st Regimt with two 24 Pounders placed on the Light House Island to prevent the Rebel Ships from annoying our Men of War when coming over the Bar of Charles Town. Light Infantry, B. Grs 7th 23d 33d and Jagers crossed the Wappoo

---

[1] See Moultrie's *Memoirs*, ed. 1802, II. 57.

Bridge under the command of Lt Genl Earl Cornwallis and Major Gen Leslie and took post at Harveys near the Entrance of Wappoo Cut. 64th took post on the ground the B. Grs left. 2 Batts of Hessn Grs took post at Perinos to cover the Provisions, &c.

March 11th Weighed at Seven in the morning and ran up with the Tide to Head Qrs at Hudsons or Perino's near the Entrance of Wappoo. Immediately went on shore to the Commander in Chief. Lord Cornwallis and General Leslie advanced with the British Flank Corps and 7th and 23d Regiments to the Main, four Miles Beyond Wapoo Bridge. Schooners pushed thro' the Bridge to receive some heavy ordnance and stores intended for a Battery to be built to Night at the mouth of the Creek next Charles Town. Colonels Fox[1] and Balfour[2] arrived to day in the Richmond from Cork. they left the Convoy consisting of Victuallers and Oat Ships at Tybee. The Russell and Robuste sailed yesterday to New York. a disagreeable rainy day. Wind South East This Night a Batty was begun on the Pt near Wappoo Cut at Fenwicks Barn.[3] 2 32Pdrs and an 8in. Howitzer mounted before day break Some Rebel Gallies and armed Brigs cannonaded the Battery, but obliged to sheer off. Battery finished next day and 4 more 32 prs mounted.

March 12th Wind S. W. very high. The Battery on the Main Side of Wappoo finished last Night and one 32 Pounder mounted, with which the mouth of the Creek was effectually cleared of Gallies and other armed Vessels. You have a fine View from the Generals door of Charles Town, from the Steeples of which everything transacted at Head Quarters may with a good Telescope be distinctly seen. The large Mortar and some Howitzers sent for from St Augustine. 64th took post near Head Qrs Regt of Huyne took their Ground.

March 13th Wind N. W. hard Gales in the Morning, but moderate towards Night. landed my Horses. The 63d Regt came over from Gibbs's and took Post near the New Cut Bridge. Major Mecan with 120 Men took Possession of a Redoubt near Fort Johnson.[4]

March 14th Wind N. W. Moderate fine day. Took a walk along Wappoo and had a very good View of Charles Town, Sullivans Island and Fort Johnson. A Battery of two 32 prs and an 8 Inch Howitzer begun a little to the left of the Battery on the Wappoo Cut. The Rebel Ships Seven in Number, with a Brig and a Galley lye under Fort Moutrie. The Guard of the 7th relieved for a Sergt and 3 Hessn Grenadrs

March 15th Wind N W. a little hazy but afterwards cleared up. A Brig with Provisions and Linnens for private Trade arrived from Glasgow. A Man hanged at Charles Town to day, in Sight of our Lines. Army as Yesterday.

---

[1] Henry Edward, younger brother of Charles James Fox.

[2] Col. Nisbet Balfour, who executed Hayne.

[3] See letter of Lieut.-Col. Laurens to Washington, March 14, 1780, in Sparks, *Corr. Amer. Rev.*, II. 413.

[4] See DeBrahm's journal in Gibbes, *Documentary History*, III. 124. Thomas Mecan was major in the Royal Welsh Fusileers.

March 16th Wind S. W. Wrote to Mr McCullogh to buy me a Saddle &c. Two men came in from the Rebels of the name of Hart, one of them a Lieut the other a Cadet in Ourrys Regt of Cavalry.[1] They are both Virginians and have deserted from Bacon Bridge above Dorchester. They report that some deserters are come in from Genl Patersons army who left it 4 days ago at Sheldon about forty Miles from Dorchester, that they consist of 1500 Infantry and 200 Cavalry and were marching Northwards, and that the Rebel Cavalry in that Neighborhood in Number 300 were preparing to move off. That the Defences of Charles Town to the land side are well finished and very strong, and that they are constantly at Work on those to the Water. That they have about 3000 fighting men in the Town, of which 1300 are Virginians, who have arrived since we came to the Province, and that we should have taken a good many of their Troops a few days ago when the General made a move if it had not been for one of our officers servants who gave them Intelligence of our approach.

March 17th Wind N. E. blows Strong but fair

March 18th Wind same rains hard. Loyalist arrived from N. York. A Galley, the Germain, and a Schooner with two 18 Prs came over the Bar to day to guard the Buoys. The Wind Shifted to N. W. about two oclock noon. The Baron de Marzerne recommended by Duke Ferdinand arrived at Head Qrs

Mar. 19th Wind N. W. with Rain in the Morning. the Scourge and Viper Gallies passed thro' the Bridge into Wappoo Creek. cleared up about noon and Wind shifted to S. W. Virginia joined the Admiral from N York

March 20th Wind N. E. a high Tide and fair day. The Admiral with 3 two Deckers 4–32 Gun Frigates and 2–20s passed the Bar of Charles Town about 7 in the Morning.[2] Capt Tonkin the agent, came to Hd Qrs from N. Edisto but brought no Ships with him. The Lady Susan Victualler one of the Iris's Convoy arrived. The Admiral sent the Commander in Chief twelve 24 prs with 100 Rounds of Ammunition for each Gun. They fired several Shot from Fort Moutrie this Evening at our Shipping.

March 21st Wind N. E. fair day. Earl of Caithness[3] arrived in the Virginia accompanied by the Loyalist from N. York with the English Mails for Octr Nov. and December arrived there in the Swift Packet. The Severest Winter at N York ever known, North River and the Narrows frozen over for Carriages and the Frost did not break up before the 20th febr. The Rebel Reinforcements of 2600 Men for the Southwd Stopt by the Weather at Trenton, from whence they could not proceed. Great Desertions in Mr Washingtons Army who were with difficulty supplied with Provisions, particularly Bread on Acc^{t} of the Mills being all frozen up. Their Magazine burnt at West Point. Several Prisoners to the amount of 400 taken in different Excursions from N York, where above 5000 of the Citizens embodied and armed themselves for the defence of the Place. The Rebel Ships at Sullivans Island moved to Coopers River except the Queen of France, which got on ground and is expected will be lost.[1] Part of the Transports from Tybee arrived.

---

[1] Daniel Horry's South Carolina Dragoons, probably.

[2] So Moultrie, II. 58; Tarleton, p. 10; Admiral Arbuthnot, in Tarleton, p. 48.; Samuel Baldwin's diary, *New Jersey Hist. Soc. Proc.*, II. 78. DeBrahm's diary in Gibbes, III. 124, gives the 21st as the date.

[3] William Sinclair, tenth earl.

March 22^{d}. Wind S. W. The Admiral, Sir Andrew Hamond[2] and Cap^{t} Elphinstone came to Head Quarters. The Hessian Grenadiers marched over Wappoo. a fair day. Light Inf^{y} 33^{d} and Jagers took post at the Church Bridge 4 Comps. of L. I. wth a party of Jagers took post in the Church over the Bridge; 3 Batt^{s} of Hess^{n} Gren^{rs} took post over the Wappoo Cut on the Ground which the l. I. 33^{d} and Jagers quitted.

March 23^{d}. Wind S. E. fair but Cloudy. Two Spies of the name of Winter and Stirling taken to day, having landed last night in New Town Cut in order to get Intelligence. One Scot, was with him but escaped. Three Battalions of Hessian Grenadiers moved yesterday over Wappoo to the Ground of a Battalion of light Infantry, which was advanced a few Miles nearer the Ferry. The Commander in Chief went out very early to reconnoitre Ashley River. The Light Corps made a Move towards Drayton Hall The Commander in Chief reconnoitred the River and Country. the light Corps remained near Drayton Hall.

March 24th. Wind S. W. Cloudy, with Thunder and lightning. The Admiral &c. returned, to five fathom Hole The 71st joined from the light House Island, the Works on which were dismantled. The remainder of the Transports arrived from Edisto. Hard Gale of Wind with Rain and Lightning in the Night A Batt^{n} of Hess^{n} Gren^{rs}[3] took post at the Church Bridge. Batt^{n} of 71st took their Ground. 24 P^{rs} sent from l. House Island to the fleet.

March 25th. Wind N. W., S. W. and S. E. fair day. Cap^{t} Saunders of the Q. R.[4] who was sent in the Galley in quest of General Patterson returned and reports that the Savannah Army passed at Jacksons Burrough yesterday at 11 oclock and was to be at Stono Ferry this Evening. That Col^{o} Tarleton had mounted all his Cavalry, and had cut up a Party of the Rebel Horse the day before yesterday, having killed ten and taken four. That the Rebels had burnt their Galley in the Cuts, and carried the Guns to Charles Town. Cap^{t} Pike sent on board the Admiral with the Commander in Chiefs Dispatches for New York and Savannah. The Iris and Hydra arrived from Tybee.

March 26th. Wind N. W. blows strong. Gen^{l} Pattersons Brigade and L^{t} Col^{o} Tarletons Cavalry both from Savannah passed Rantols Bridge from Stono Ferry, where they halted last Night. Cap^{t} Evans and some officers of the Navy came up with 75 Flat Boats from the Fleet.

---

[1] Baldwin, II. 78.

[2] Post-captain ; afterwards governor of Nova Scotia.

[3] The Battalion von Linsingen. Eelking, tr. Stone, p. 179.

[4] Captain John Saunders of the Queen's Rangers, afterward chief-justice of New Brunswick. Sabine, *American Loyalists*, ed. 1847, pp. 593, 594.

March 27th Wind N. and afterwards S. W. The Boats passed to Night by Charles Town to Linings 64 march'd over Wappoo in Possession of the Batteries Huynes Regt took their Ground.

March 28th Wind S. E. Hazy. The Botetourt Treasury armed Ship arrived with the Jany Mail. British Grenadiers Hessian Grenadiers, 7th 23d and 71st marched and took post near Drayton Hall. Corps under General Paterson marched from Rantols Bridge, So and No Carolina Volrs took post near Linings. Legion mounted and [*illegible*] near Drayton Hall. Head Qrs changed from Perinaus to Drayton Hall.

March 29th Wind S. E. Foggy morning. The Boats passed from Linings to Drayton Hall about 3 in the Morning. When the Fog cleared away the Troops consisting of the British Genadiers and Light Infantry, Hessian Grenadiers, Jagers 200, 7th, 33d and two Battalions of 71st embarked, and the whole with the Field Artillery and Horses were passed over to Fullers House about 13 Miles from Charles Town by 3 oclock[1], and immediately marched to Ashley Ferry about five miles Head Quarters being at Mr Bellingers House nine Miles from Charles Town This important event was effected without giving the least Alarm with the Boats, or suffering the least Opposition on our landing or in our March. The 23d and the Cavalry masked the Roads in the front of the Embarkation, which when completed they fell back to the cross Roads and the Ferry. The Enemy had three Breast Works thrown up on the Causeway leadg to the Ferry which we demolished as soon as we took possession of the Ground.

March 30th Wind S. E. Hazy, attended with small Rain towards Evening. The Army moved about half after nine in the morning towards Charles Town, in one column, by half Companies an Officer and 30 Jagers advanced, followed by the Commander in Chief, Lord Cornwallis General Leslie and their Suites. Flankers of Jagers on each Side. The remainder of that Corps followed immediately after. Two Battalions of Light Infantry next. Brigade of British Grenadiers followed them and the Hessian Grenadiers brought up the Rear. The 7th 33d and 71st Regiments formed the Corps de Reserve and covered the Baggage. About a Mile beyond the Governors Gate two miles and half from Charles Town an advanced Picquet of the Enemy fired out of a wood on the left of the Line of March upon the Avant Guard and the General Officers,[2] when Lord Caithness who attended the General was unfortunately shot thro the Body. The firing growing brisker the Jagers pushed up and spread, and the Light Infantry advanced and formed as fast as they came up. The Enemy immediately fell back but kept up a considerable fire from behind the Trees which was answered from our light Troops. it continued from ¼ before twelve oclock to about a quarter after, when the hottest of the firing Ceased, and gradually died away to an Exchange of Shot at a considerable distance, from the advanced Centries. One Jager only was badly wounded on this Occasion. The army encamped in the Evening in three lines extending from one Side of the Neck to the other. The light Infantry and Jagers the first, about 1600 yds from the Enemys first line, Brigade of 3 Grenadiers the 2d 300 yds in their rear with Hd Qrs at Williams on their right. The Hessian Grenadiers some distance behind them, and Col. Webster wth the 7th 33d and 71st 2 Bat. formed the 3d being faced outwards to cover the Camp from an attack from the Country. About ½ after four their Galley had got up and began firing on our left flank, but without any effect being at too great a Distance. about the same time Two Battalions of the Rebels with two field Pieces advanced rapidly from their Works and attacked a little Redoubt in our front occupied by 20 Jagers, who finding themselves not supported and having no bayonets retired with the Loss of two Jagers slightly wounded and one missing (who was afterwards found murdered inhumanly in the Woods) the Enemy were however drove out of the work very soon after by a Six Pounder which was run up from the right for this purpose.

---

[1] Clinton, in Tarleton, p. 38; Stedman, p. 177; DeBrahm, in Gibbes, III. 124; Baldwin, p. 80; Woodford, Lincoln and Laurens to Washington, in Sparks, *Corr.*, II. 431, 433, 435; Lincoln to Washington, July 17, 1780, in *Charleston Year-Book* for 1897, p. 375.

[2] Laurens's skirmish; De Brahm, in Gibbes, III. 124.

March 31st. Wind S. E. hazy and rainy part of the day rest very hot. Employed in getting ashore the artillery and frames for Batteries.

April 1st Wind N. W. A Very strong Gale of Wind in the Night attended with a sharp Frost A very strong working party of 1500 covered by 1500 more pushed out at Sun Set from our left to within 1000 Yards of the enemy's first Line, where three Strong Redoubts were thrown up in the night without Molestation or being perceived by the Rebels, under Cover of the light Infantry who were advanced to within 500 yards of the Enemys works on the Charles Town Road.[1] at day Break they fell back to the Redoubts, where they took post. Some Shots were fired at our Works at daylight, but no other Obstruction was given. The Commander in Chief and General Officers lay all night at the Head of the Reserve.

April 2d Wind S. W. a fair day. The Rebels pretty quiet to day and by their hurrawing appear to be Dragging up Cannon. British and Hessian Grenadiers in the Trenches to night. Another Redoubt thrown up to the right of the road, but not entirely finished. Several Cannon landed in the Course of the day. Major Grahams[2] light Infantry passed the Ashley last night and took post near the light Infantry Camp.

April 3d. Wind N. E. dark and hazy. The Rebels kept up a considerable fire from their Works and one Ship they had brought up Some Negroes came in from Charles Town and Report that the Enemy have received a Reinforcement from N Carolina within these two days, that they lost one Captain a Subaltern and seven privates killed and 30 wounded on the 30th ult. In the Course of the day the Rebels fired near 300 Shot and 30 small Shells, but did no manner of Injury. It rain'd very hard in the Night. another Redoubt erected on the left of the Parallel within 400 yds of the Enemy[1]

---

[1] Clinton, in Tarleton, p. 39; Stedman, p. 178; Andrew Sherburne, p. 27, 2d ed.; journal in Moultrie, II. 66; Baldwin, p. 81. Lincoln is apparently wrong in putting this a night earlier. Sparks, *Corr.*, II. 433, *Year-Book* for 1897, p. 375.

[2] Major Charles Graham, of the 42d (Royal Highland) Regiment.

April 4th Wind S. W. in the Morning and N. W. in the Evening. A very heavy Cannonade kept up all the Morng against our Redoubts from the Town and two Frigates who moved up the Town Creek to enfilade the Redoubt erected last night by which one man of 33d was killed, two 24 Pds run to the left; a shot from which taking place in one of their Ships that annoyed us most drove them down the River again, and they came to an Anchor off Hobcaw Ferry. Two Rebel Dragoons came in with their Horses from Goose Creek they belong to Baylors light Horse One officer of the 42d wounded, two Hessian and one Grenadier of 71st deserted. The Legion Cavalry and Infantry passed over and took post about four Miles in our Rear at the Qr House Five Redoubts and our communication between the Redoubts strengthened. Battery of five 24s will be finished to Night My Mare foaled today.

Aprl 5th Wind N.W. in the Morning, afterwards easterly. The firing not so frequent in the Morning as yesterday, but increased in both Shot and Shells toward evening, when the Gallies advanced from Wappoo and fired into the Town[2] as did the Battery within the Creek, where the 64th are, which put an immediate Stop to the Enemys Cannon. The Convoy for New York from Tybee appeared off the Harbour and came to an Anchor. Capt Collin, 3 Subalterns and 53 of the Royall Artillery, who were saved out of the Russia Merchn arrived from Bermudas. Lieut Grant of the 42nd wounded. A new Redoubt thrown up this night between Nos 1 and 2. Two more Grenadiers from 43d and 7th deserted. The Enemy's two frigates hauled over to the other Side of the Cooper. another Redoubt finished, which completes the first Parallel. The Legion went foraging today.

April 6th. Wind N. W. The Enemy's Batteries were pretty quiet all the morning, but began again about 3 in the afternoon; and fired Shot and Shells the whole Night, whilst we were employed in draging Cannon to the Battery, in which however we made but a poor Progress on account of the Badness of the Roads.

April 7th. Wind N. W. in the Morning, about noon East and by South. A Reinforcement of Troops came down from Wando to Charlestown in two Brigs and 9 Schooners—supposed about 800 men under General Woodford A Feu de Joie fired from their Lines and 3 Huzaas in Consequence.[3] Major McLeroth reported that his firing the other Night knocked down part of the Work, destroyed many of the platforms, and broke the Carriages of several of his Guns in the Battery at Wappoo.

[1] Baldwin, p. 81; Lincoln, p, 433; De Brahm, p. 125.

[2] Baldwin, *ibid.*; De Brahm, *ibid.*

[3] So Woodford to Washington, in Sparks, *Corr.*, II. 431, and Baldwin, p. 81. This date must be accepted, though the diaries in Moultrie, II. 67, and Gibbes, III. 125, give April 6.

April 8th. Wind S. E. dark hazy day and a fresh Breeze. About ten minutes before 4 in the afternoon, about the last of the Ebb, The Admiral in the Roebuck, accompanied by the Richmond the Romulus, Raleigh, Virginia, Blonde Sandwich and Renown, weigh'd and proceeded to Fort Johnson passing within 800 yds. of Fort Moutrie where they have about Twenty 42 Pounders They were just one Hour and 16 Minutes under the fire of Sullivans Island before the Whole passed, without receiving any other damage than the Loss of the Richmonds foretopmast, and 7 killed and 18 wounded in all the Ships. The wind Shifted to the S. W. with Rain in a little time after they came to an Anchor. The Rebels fired but 3 or 4 Shots from the Town towards our Works, whilst our fleet was passing and ceased giving us any further trouble for the rest of the Night, during which we threw up another 10 Gun Battery. 4 more Guns drawn up in the Course of the night. The Æolus Transport got ashore in passing and was burnt.[1]

April 9th. Wind S. W. fair Day. The Rebels in Town very quiet, not above three Shot fired. Several of their Boats, and some very large observed passing the Cooper loaded with Goods and Passengers. Some say they saw Troops and field artilly in them, so that we have every reason to fear they are preparing either to evacuate the place or capitulate. The Blonde Raleigh and Sandwich weigh'd from Fort Johnson this morning and took a Position within half Musket Shot of Shutes Folly. The Admiral and Sir Andrew Hammond came to Hd. Qrs. another Battery erected within 450 yards of the Rebel Lines.

April 10th. Wind N. W. fair Day. The Rebels fired but few Shot in the Morning. however a man of the 42d light Infantry was killed by a Shell in the Trenches. Major Crosbie, the Generals first Aid de Camp, was sent to the Town about Sun Set with a Summons, and after being detained an hour brought back an Answer from Genl. Lincoln that Duty and Inclination pointed to the propriety of supporting the Town to the last Extremity.[2] Soon after his Return the firing upon our Works recommenced with some Vigor, but their Guns appear to be only Nine Pounders. We got 14–24 Prs. mounted last night, and another Battery thrown up between Nos 3 and 4. Lieut Fitzroy Aid de Camp to Lord Cornwallis was slightly wounded with a Cannon Ball in the Trenches. They have now fired at us above 4000 Shot and Shells from which only two Lives have been lost and about five men wounded. A Deserter came in from Chas Town belonging to Woodfords Brigade, about 800. They march'd from Trenton last Christmas and arrived at Charles Town the 7th Inst he says they brought with them 13 or 14 Pieces of Cannon, which are expected every hour under the Escort of 300 Men.

---

[1] This helps to fix upon the eighth as the date of this operation, a date about which there have been singular discrepancies. For the eighth we have Captain Russell's diary, that of Samuel Baldwin, in the *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society*, II. 82, Sir Henry Clinton's report in Tarleton, p. 39, the letters of Lincoln and Laurens to Washington, in Sparks, II. 434, 436, the manuscript journals cited by Lowell in his *Hessians*, p. 247, the journal of De Brahm, in Gibbes, III. 125, and the letter of W. Croghan to Michael Gratz, dated April 8, in Gibbes, III. 130. On the other hand Admiral Arbuthnot himself, (in Tarleton, p. 49), Ramsay, II. 51, Tarleton, p. 11, Stedman, p. 180, and Ewald, give the date as April 9. But perhaps none of these was an eye-witness except Arbuthnot. Moultrie in a letter dated April 8, II. 63, and in the journal which he quotes, II. 67, makes the date the seventh. The date April 7 might also be inferred from Woodford's letter to Washington, in Sparks, II. 441; but the context would seem to show that that letter is misdated, and that "yesterday" means the 8th. On the whole the weight of first-hand evidence is for April 8.

[2] The documents are given in Tarleton, pp. 56–58; in Ramsay, II. 399, 400; and in the *Charleston Year-Book* for 1897, pp. 379, 380.

April 11th Wind N. W. in the Morng afterwards S. W. The Admiral and Sir Andrew Hamond returned over the Ashley accompanied by the Commander in Chief. Not many Shots fired by the Rebels in the Course of the day. Began second Parallel.

Aprl 12th Wind N. E. with Rain. The 23d Regiment crossed to day, and the Mail from England came up from the Dashwood Packet. The Bags had been all opened before it came to Hd Qrs. Two Deserters came in our loss as yet not exceeding 12 Men Killed and wounded Batteries all ready this night.

Aprl 13th Wind N. E. disagreeably cold. We opened our Batteries consisting of 24 — 24 Pounders several Howitzers mortars and Cohorns from 10 to 5½ Inches the fire from which continued very brisk all day and night.[1] An Artillery Man killed and another wounded by one of our Guns in consequence of carelessness in not stopping the Vent. Col. Webster with the 33d Legion mounted and dismounted Detachment of 17th Dragoons, Fergusons Corps and N. Carolina Volunteers marched to Goose Creek Bridge and passed to the other side of Strawberry ferry.[2] The 64th crossed over to this Side from Linings.

Apl 14th Wind N. E. fair day. The Enemys Batteries effectually silenced by our superior fire, and the Jager redoubt pushed so near their Works that not a Man dare shew himself above the Parapet for our Rifles[3] the 64th marched to Strawberry. Col. Tarleton surprised the Enemys Cavalry and took near 220 Horses and 70 Dragoons and Militia, wth above 40 Wagons[4] The 64th marched to join Col. Webster at Strawberry our Jagers posted in the advanced work, and kept the Rebel fire pretty well under by firing into the Embrasures and thereby preventing their loading.

Apl 15th Wind N. E. fair day. The Rebels have got Sand Bags on their Parapets, which cover their Musquetry[5] and have opened more Batteries. The 13½ Mortar arrived from St Augustine. A very considerable fire of Musquetry from the Rebels all night upon our approaches, which were pushed by Sap from the right and left of our Works to within 250 yards of those of the Enemy; Our Batteries also expended a great deal of Ammunition.

---

[1] Diaries in Moultrie, II. 70, and Gibbes, III. 126.

[2] Tarleton, pp. 15, 16.

[3] Baldwin says, under the same date, p. 84, "No mischief has been done by their firing except wounding one man."

[4] Affair at Monk's Corner, Tarleton, pp. 15–17; Stedman, p. 183; Ramsay, II. 53, 64.

[5] See Moultrie, II. 85, second note.

Apl 16th Wind N. E. fair day but Cold. A Rebel Galley came up the Cooper and anchored within 1000 Yards of the Hospl against which they fired two 24 Prs for several Hours, without doing any other Mischief than wounding a Horse.[1] The Sap pushed very forward both on right and left. Two Deserters came in, who report that the Enemy have had only two Men killed and two Guns dismounted by our Cannon, which after striking their Works pass over them into the Town. The Prisoners and some Wagons arrived from Colo. Webster.

Apl 17th Wind N. E. fair day. An Empty 13 Inch Shell thrown into the Town to shew them what we had in our power to do. The Enemy appear to be very busy at Hobcaw, where they had a Battery and some works, as if they were going to abandon it. The Galley remains

Apl 18th Wind N. E. Dark cloudy day with Rain at times and very cold. Colo Balfour marched with 23d Regt to take post at Biggins Bridge in order to communicate with Colo Webster. The New York Fleet under the Convoy of the Rainbow arrived this morng off Charles Town Bar, havg on board the 42d Queens Rangers Prince of Wales Volunteers, Volunteers of Ireland, and the Hessian Regiment of Ditforth, containg 2500 Effective men.[2] Blows hard from N. W with Rain.

Apl 19th Wind N. E. a Gale of Wind in the Morning but more moderate in the afternoon at N. W. Mr Gordon arrived with the Dispatches from the York fleet. 3 Men killed and 3 wounded in the Trenches, five Sailors wounded on board the Galley whilst they were joining the Admiral from Wappoo.[3] The Rebel Shot from the Town reached as far as Fort Johnson. Our Left Sap pushed to Night within 100 Yards of the Ditch.

Apl 20th. Wind N. W. blows strong a Man killed by a Shell and a Jager by a twelve pound Shot. A Deserter came in from the Town who reports that a woman from the Country brought thither a Report that Colo Webster was within three miles of the Bridge going to Fort Sullivan, and had had a Brush with the Rebels in Christ-church Parish and had taken several Pieces of Cannon. He also says there are two Parties in the Town one for surrendering the Place, the other for effecting the Escape of the Army, who he believes are preparing to go off. very little firing this afternoon from either Side, and scarce any from the Enemy the whole Night. The Sachem of the Creeks arrived at Hd Quarters.

April 21st Wind S. W. fair day moderate. No firing all the morng. at 12 oclock a Flag came in from the Enemy, with a Letter from General Lincoln addressed only to the Commander in Chief desiring a Cessation of Hostilities for 6 Hours, and that he was willing to treat for the Surrender of the Town if he could obtain Terms honorable to the Army and Safe to the Inhabitants. The Truce granted for the time asked, and permission asked and given for an Aid de Camp to carry their Pro-

[1] De Brahm, in Gibbes, III. 126.

[2] Clinton, in Tarleton, p. 41.

[3] Baldwin, pp. 85, 86; De Brahm, p. 126.

posals to the Admiral, who returned with Major Crosbie, and after a Consultation held between him, the General and Lord Cornwallis on another Letter from Gen^{l} Lincoln which arrived at seven in the Evening, an answer was sent by Cap^{t} S^{t} George, who brought back Gen^{l} Lincolns Refusal of the Terms offered.[1] Hostilities therefore recommenced on both Sides about a quarter before eleven at Night. The Anna Theresa Packet arrived to day from the West Indies with news that a Supply of Ammunition from Major Gen^{l} Vaughan[2] would be sent under Convoy of the Guadaloupe. began the third Parallel.

April 22^{d} Wind S. W. fair day. The Admiral &c returned. The Queens Rangers and Vol^{rs} of Ireland came over to this Side. The Keppel Brig returned in seven days from S^{t} Augustine with 3000 24 p^{d} Shot. A considerable Fire kept up on both Sides the whole day and Night. Two Men killed by the Rebel Musquetry in the advanced Sap. A Letter arrived from the Admiral. L^{t} Gov^{r} Graham[3] and M^{r} M^{c} Cullogh arrived from Savannah. The Rebels had the Insolence yesterday to ask Liberty for all their Troops to march out of the Town with every Military Honor and retire where they pleased. The French Troops of which there are 900 to be transported to Cape Francois, where also the French Ships should have leave to go to, and the Continental Frigates to the Delaware. The Hospital to be taken Care of at the Kings Expense, and the Inhabitants Secured in their property, which being rejected, they sent a Verbal Message, they would deliver up the Town upon no other Terms, upon which our Batteries immediately opened. 2 Men killed and three Wounded in the Trenches to Night. The 42^{d} came over to this side.

April 23^{d} Wind S. W. fair day and very hot. A Letter this Morn. from Colonel Webster that he was to be at Cain-Hoy last night. all was well and everything the General wished accomplished. the Welch Fuzileers to join him Yesterday, but stopped by order until relieved by the Queens Rangers who marched this Morning to the Quarter House and the Volunteers of Ireland, N. York Volunteers and Carolinians pass over the Cooper to Night under Lord Cornwallis, who takes the Command of the whole on that Side, and it is supposed will soon be Master of all the Enemys Communications and means of Escape by Land. Captain Tonkin goes with some armed Vessels to Spinner's Inlet. Two men killed by Musquetry and L^{t} Freeman of 64th wounded to day. The Sap pushed close to the Ditch, within Sixty Yards of the Enemys Works.

Ap^{l} 24th Wind S. W. fair day The Rebels made a Sortie this Morning a little before daylight and attacked the left Sap, where they killed some, took one Jager and eight of the Line, and wounded a few more. I fear our Covering Troops were asleep or not so attentive as they ought.[4]

---

[1] Documents in Moultrie, II. 73–78, and in *Charleston Year-Book* for 1897, pp. 357, 358, 380–383.

[2] At this time commander-in-chief in the Leeward Islands.

[3] John Graham, Loyalist, lieutenant-governor of Georgia.

[4] Lieut. Col. Henderson's sortie. Moultrie, II. 78, 79; Ramsay, II. 55; Gibbes, III. 127, 132.

General Paterson and 63d Regt passed over to day. The Admiral sent the General word that at 10 oclock today some Frigates and Gallies would pass into the Cooper. Orders were sent accordingly to the Batteries to fire Shells, red Shot and Carcasses towards the Wharfs of the Town as soon as their Attack began upon our Shipping, but no attempt was made notwithstanding.

Apl 25th Wind S. W. a fair day and very hot. About 1 oclock in the Morng a most tremendous Fire of Cannon Shells and Musquetry commenced from the Trenches and the Rebel Works and continued about half an Hour. it proceeded from an Alarm being given by our working Party who were running their Sap to the Ditch, that the Enemy were making a Sortie, but it proceeded no further than their forming behind their first abbatis. an Ensign McGregor of the 71st was killed, Capt McCloud of the 42d was wounded, three killed and 15 wounded on this Occasion. It is feared that our Troops in the right Trenches fired on our working Party, mistaking them upon their hurrawing (which was the Signal they were ordered by Genl Kospoth to give on the approach of an Enemy, and retire to their Arms) for the Rebels. The whole Line was under Arms but returned to their Tents about two oclock.[1]

April 26th Wind W. S. W. a very hot day. Ensign Cameron of 71st wounded. three Men killed and as many wounded to day. Several Deserters, both soldiers and Townsmen came in. They all agree in reporting that most of the Continental Troops have been withdrawn from Fort Sullivan. The Troops have recd orders not to fire Musquetry at Night without particular Orders.

Apl 27th Wind N. E. excessive cold. rained a good deal last night

April 28th Wind N. E. afterwards S. E. fair day, but cold in the Morning. Recd an Acct from the Admiral that Lord Cornwallis appeared on Mt Pleasant the Morning of the 26th[2] when the Rebels abandoned a little Work there, where they had one eighteen Pounder. that his Lordship afterwards reconnoitred Lampreys, but thought it too strong to be carried by a Coup de Main, and he accordingly marched towards Wappataw at one in the Morning. The Admiral therefore yesterday Evening landed about 500 Sailors and Marines with an Intention of throwing up a work upon Mount Pleasant, but his Guard Boats having in the Night taken a Schooner with about 80 French and Continental Troops, part of the Garrison at Lampries, who informed him that the Rebels were retiring from that Post, This Marine Detachment marched thither this morning and finding the Works abandoned took Possession of them. They found there 4—18 prs and four 4 pdrs and about 50 Convalescents in the Hospital. We therefore had the Pleasure to see the British flag flying there about three in the afternoon. Our Troops employed in Completing the third Parallel and advancing Cannon into the Batteries of it.

April 29th Wind S. E. blows fresh, but nothing attempted to come into the Cooper. One of the Gallies, the Comet, got on ground yesterday in the Hog Island Channel and was sunk by the Rebel Shot from a field Piece which the Rebels run out to Mt Pleasant from Sullivans Island after Lord Cornwallis had left it.

---

[1] An explanation is to be found in Moultrie, II. 79, 82.

[2] Or afternoon of the 25th, Moultrie, II. 79.

Apl 30th Wind S by W. blows excessive hard. five Sailors deserted to us from a Rebel Galley. Some Men killed and wounded to day. No Move of the ships yet. Third Parallel finished.

May 1st Wind S by W. very high. 2 Bucks County, 2 Legion and 1 Pioneer who had been Prisoners in Charles Town, deserted from thence this Morning by Swimg. a five Gun Battery close to the Ditch and opposite to the Gate finished this evening. The Guns all up, one mounted, and the rest ready. The Ditch drained to Night, and the left Sap carried into the Ditch. Ferguson's Corps took Possession of Lamprieres. The Rebels fired a great deal in the Beginning of the Night, and they frequently fire ragged Pieces of Iron, broken Bottles &c. old Axes, Gun Barrels, Tomaw Hawks &c. A Prize Sloop fitted up at the Ship Yard with 2 eighteen Prs and four 4 Prs under the Command of Mr Buchanan of the Perseus. No Move of the Ships yet, and I fancy the Admiral has given over all thoughts of entering the Cooper.

May 2d Wind W. by S. blows fresh. a great deal of firing all day and part of the Night from the Rebel Batteries. some Deserters came in. The 64th ordered from Lord Cornwallis to this Side, and part of them crossed to night from Scots.

May 3d Wind S. W. very hot. The remainder of the 64th came over.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria. By MORRIS JASTROW, JR., Ph.D., Professor of Semitic Languages in the University of Pennsylvania. (Boston: Ginn and Co. 1898. Pp. xii, 780.)

THE publication of a series of handbooks on the history of religions is one of the many proofs of the growing interest in this study. The series of which the present volume is one is intended especially for use in college and university classes. The first of these handbooks to appear was that by Professor Hopkins, of Yale, on the *Religions of India.* The present work is the second volume, and the author, Professor Jastrow, is also the general editor of the series.

The task of writing at the present time a handbook of the religion of Babylonia and Assyria was one of peculiar difficulty, because the study of Assyriology, as the deciphering and interpretation of the cuneiform texts is called, is a comparatively recent thing, and the changes in our knowledge, or sometimes our supposed knowledge, of Assyria and Babylonia have been frequent and often startling, owing to the continuous discovery of new material. At the present moment at least two important expeditions are at work in Babylonia, and the discoveries which they will make may fairly be expected to add very largely to our present stock of knowledge, if not to change materially many of the views now held. In addition to this, there is, in the museums of Europe and of this country, an immense amount of inscribed material from Babylonia which has not yet been thoroughly worked over. Furthermore, it must be said that Assyriologists have shown a marked inclination to present astonishing theories, and, so to speak, to claim everything in sight, which often renders it difficult to use satisfactorily the material actually published.

It was with considerable curiosity that we opened this book, wondering how, in view of the tentative condition of our knowledge in many matters, the author would deal with his subject; and we laid it down with the conviction that Professor Jastrow had guided his bark with remarkable skill through the narrow and dangerous passage between the Scylla of wild speculation on the one hand, and the Charybdis of knownothingism and uncertainty on the other He appears to have shown sound judgment in picking out what is really known, and so arranging and coordinating that material as to present an intelligible and coherent picture of the religion of Babylonia and Assyria. The matter is not presented with any particular charm of style—rather the contrary—nor with that plausibility which sometimes carries one away contrary to one's better judgment; but there is an effect of sober good sense and sound learning, which makes the reader feel that what is here set down may be accepted, and that it is not a mere spinning of hypotheses to be torn to pieces by the next newest discovery. Rather, we seem to have the framework of a good, solid building, which future discoveries will only wall in where walls are still lacking, and furnish where it is still unfurnished. The author is quite frank in pointing out what is not known or uncertain, and this very frankness helps to make the reader rely upon his statements where he does claim to know. There is nowhere in the book that cocksure attitude which Assyriologists seem somewhat prone to assume.

After an introductory chapter on "Sources and Methods of Study," and a second on "The Land and the People," Professor Jastrow introduces us to the old Babylonian Pantheon. Starting "with that phase of religious beliefs known as Animism, which has been ascertained to be practically universal in primitive society," and pointing out that the "Babylonian religion in the oldest form known to us may be best described as a mixture of local and nature cults" (p. 48), he then takes up, one by one, the names of gods found in the oldest inscriptions, from Tello and Nippur, and traces through some two hundred pages the development and modification of this Pantheon. We have first the gods prior to the days of Hammurabi; then we have the Pantheon as reconstituted when Babylon became the leading city of the country under Hammurabi; next, the Pantheon as it showed itself in the period of Assyrian supremacy; and finally the Pantheon in the neo-Babylonian period, under Nebuchadrezzar and his successors. At first, it must be confessed, this seems to be tedious and unprofitable reading (and we are still inclined to believe that it might be compressed with advantage). There is a chaos of vague and repetitious gods, all singularly alike, except for the differences of their unpronounceable names. But little by little, if the reader persists, he will begin to realize that there is a development in the conceptions of these gods. The chaos of fragments of half-known gods begins to show signs of intelligible arrangement; you find evidences of reflection; theological ideas begin to make themselves felt; and before long you are experiencing something of the joy of the excavator in an ancient Babylonian mound, when he realizes stratification in the material which had at first seemed to him absolutely chaotic. Gradually what was at first so tedious becomes actually fascinating, as you see how political influences affect the conceptions and relations of the gods, how the predominance of the city of Babylon and the establishment there of a great empire, controlling all the small states, brings about this simplification of the Pantheon and its re-arrangement around Marduk, the great god of the capital city. Professor Jastrow sums this up in the concluding chapter of the book where he says (p. 691): "The centralization of political power and of religious supremacy is concomitant with the focussing of intellectual life in Babylon. The priests of Marduk set the fashion in theological thought. So far as possible, the ancient traditions and myths were reshaped so as to contribute to the glory of Marduk. The chief part in the work of creation is assigned to him. The storm-god En-lil is set aside to make room for the solar diety Marduk."

After the chapters which discuss the nature and functions of the gods of Babylon and Assyria in the different periods, follow chapters on "The Religious Literature of Babylonia," "The Magical Texts" (one of the most interesting chapters in the entire book), "The Prayers and Hymns," "Penitential Psalms," and "Oracles and Omens." These chapters deal with the development of ritual and its application to the needs of life. How is man to be protected against the evil influences and the evil spirits which surround him? How is he to be saved from sin and its consequences? What is sin and how is he to know the will of the gods, to disobey which is sin? How is he to be guided in the way of righteousness and prosperity, and how shall he be warned against the calamity which lurks in his path? It is the object of religion to care for these things, and these chapters show the way in which Babylonian priests and theologians conceived that this should be done. We have here a development from the times of unreflecting folk-religion on to the stage of theological thought and reflection. These texts show us something of the same sort of development which we find in the law-books of the Hebrew scriptures. They were finally shaped by the priests in the temples, but they contain much that originated in the period of folk-religion. It is interesting to observe that Professor Jastrow fixes the time of the formulation of the ritual, in the shape in which it has practically come down to us, in the period of Hammurabi and his immediate successors (about 2200 to 2000 B. C.). They reshaped and adapted it to the theological views of their time, and to the new religion, if one may so call it, of Marduk. The changes which took place after that are of minor importance.

Next follow chapters on "The Cosmology of the Babylonians" and the closely connected subject of astrology. "The Gilgamesh Epic" is treated in considerable detail, and is followed by a chapter on "Myths and Legends." Then comes an important and interesting discussion of "The Views of Life after Death," and then, at still greater length, a description of "The Temples and the Cult." This last chapter seems to us less satisfactory than those which precede it, presumably because, in spite of recent excavations, we are not yet in a position to reconstruct the Babylonian temples with any degree of detail, and our knowledge of the cult is extremely vague.

It is noticeable that Professor Jastrow is not carried away with that excess of enthusiasm which often leads a writer to become a partisan of his theme. In the concluding chapter, which gives a general estimate of the religion, he says (p. 696): "From the standpoint of religious doctrine, accordingly, the religion of Babylonia and Assyria does not occupy a unique position. In this respect, the Egyptian religion reaches a higher level." And on the same page, speaking of the tendency toward monotheism in the religions of the Babylonians and Assyrians, on which undue stress is often laid, he says: "No decided steps in this direction were ever taken. Both in the south and in the north, this tendency is but the expression of the pre-eminent rank accorded to Marduk and Ashur, respectively. The independent existence of two heads in the combined pantheon was sufficient to prevent the infusion of an ethical spirit into this monotheistic tendency; and unless a monotheistic conception of the universe is interpreted in an ethical sense, monotheism (or monolatry) has no great superiority, either religiously or philosophically, over polytheism.'' In the same chapter he points out the influence of Babylonian religion upon both Judaism and Christianity. In regard to the former he maintains that while the ''stimulus to religious advance came to the Hebrews from the ancient centres of thought and worship in the Euphrates valley,'' on the other hand ''degrading tendencies, too, found an extrance into post-exilic Judaism through Babylonian influence. Close contact of Jews with Babylonians served to make the former more accessible to the popular beliefs in incantations and the power of demons than they would otherwise have been.'' Christianity was directly affected by Babylonian influences, as well as indirectly, through Judaism, and the direct influences which came to Christianity from the Babylonian religion were all bad, inasmuch as they came from the period of its decay. Gnosticism Professor Jastrow regards as a survival of the religion of Babylonia under the mask of Christianity.

Professor Jastrow is conservative not only with regard to the very ancient dates now assigned to Babylonian antiquity, but also with regard to the influence of the Babylonian religion and culture upon China and Egypt, which are so positively asserted in some quarters. On the other hand, while thus wisely cautious, he does not fail to make clear the great debt which the world of thought owes to Babylonian culture, as well in in the field of religion as in that of art and science.

As this is a handbook for study, the author has provided a very thorough bibliography of his subject, covering over thirty pages, and divided for greater convenience of use under some nine different subtitles. The index covers more than forty pages, but even then it is not complete, as we have found in our endeavor to look up certain things.

Space does not permit the criticism in detail of the passages which we had marked for that purpose. In a few places we noted curious little errors, which may possibly be due to faulty proof-reading, like the half-consistent substitution of ''capitol'' for ''capital'' in a number of chapters. But these are small matters. The book is a valuable contribution to the comparative study of religions. JOHN P. PETERS.

Jewish Religious Life after the Exile. By the Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford, Canon of Rochester. [American Lectures on the History of Religions, Third Series, 1897–1898.] (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1898. Pp. xxii, 270.)

THE literature of the Jews in the Persian and Greek periods has long been with Professor Cheyne a subject of special study, the fruits of which are embodied in a series of volumes on Isaiah, the Psalms, and the Wisdom Books, and in numerous articles in current periodicals. These lectures are thus "a provisional summing up of a series of special researches" (p. xxi), and as such, although primarily addressed to a popular audience, claim the attention of historical students.

The first two lectures are devoted to the history of the restoration. On the questions which have been so much discussed since Kosters challenged the generally accepted views, Professor Cheyne's opinion is briefly this: No great number of Jews returned from Babylonia to Palestine in the reign of Cyrus; those who did so went in the suite of Sheshbazzar, a prince of the house of David whom Cyrus appointed governor of Judea; among them were Sheshbazzar's nephew Zerubbabel, and Joshua, "who became the first high priest in the post-exilic sense;" the character of the community in Judea was not affected by their coming. It was not until Nehemiah, in the reign of Artaxerxes (Longimanus?) had restored the fortifications of Jerusalem that radical reforms were possible. The work of reform begun by Nehemiah was carried on by Ezra, who, with a company of men of kindred spirit, came up from Babylonia for that purpose. Ezra organized the Jewish church by a solemn covenant upon the basis of a new law-book which he brought with him and of which he was the author. The counterpart of his work was the founding of a rival Samaritan church by Manasseh, the banished grandson of the high priest Eliashib.

The following lectures are on Jewish Religious Ideals (the Messianic hope; inner conflicts), Jewish Wisdom (Proverbs, Job), Orthodox and Heretical Wisdom, and Contemporary Levitical Piety (Ecclesiastes, Sirach); the last lecture touches on the attitude of Judaism to foreigners, the rise of the beliefs in immortality and resurrection, the influence of Babylonian, Persian and Greek ideas.

The sources for the history of the restoration are very meagre. For the condition of affairs in Judea between 520 and 516, and the building of the temple, we have the testimony of the contemporary prophets Haggai and Zechariah. The remains of the Memoirs of Nehemiah, besides acquainting us with a man of strong character, give us a glimpse of the state of things in the next century—if his Artaxerxes be Longimanus and not Mnemon. For the rest, we have a few documents whose genuineness is vigorously impugned, and an account of the work of Ezra, chiefly from the hand of a late and untrustworthy writer (the Chronicler). In the latter, Professor Cheyne sets aside Ezra ix. and Neh. viii. as entirely unhistorical, but thinks that the substantial truth of Neh. ix. may still be admitted, though the background of the narrative is false.

This scanty material is supplemented by numerous passages in the poets and the prophetical writings—especially the latter part of the Book of Isaiah—in which Professor Cheyne finds allusions to the events or situations of the period. There is large room here for that "imaginative criticism" which he describes as an intuitive perception of what must have been, and against the depreciation of which he protests (p. 4).

Speaking of the work of Ezra he writes, "If the traditional picture of his activity is not fully historical, it devolves upon us to fill up the deficiencies of the narrative by reasonable conjecture" (p. 69). This describes very well what the author has attempted in his sketch of the work of Ezra and his Samaritan double, Manasseh; he has endeavored to supply the lack of sufficient and trustworthy historical sources by an ingenious conjectural reconstruction. Nor is it only in the absence of sources that he employs this method. In the description of the conduct of Sanballat he discredits the explicit testimony of Nehemiah as warped by prejudice and excessive suspicion; Sanballat planned no treachery, he was sincerely desirous of making a compromise, and was driven into hostility only by the obstinate refusal of Nehemiah to treat with him (p. 48 f.). Such a thing is conceivable enough; but that a theory is conceivable, or even plausible, does not justify the substitution of it for the testimony of a competent and generally credible witness, unless that testimony can be impeached on other grounds. The text is treated with the same license. In two places in Ezekiel the name of Daniel occurs (xiv. 14, xxviii. 3); though all extant witnesses support the text, Professor Cheyne says that "any one can see" that it must be wrong, and substitutes Enoch in both places.

The last four lectures treat of several aspects of religious thought in post-exilic times; though the two on Jewish Wisdom really deal rather with the literary products of the movement. In this part of the book the author is going over subjects on which he has written more fully elsewhere. It is interesting to note his change of view in regard to some of them. Ecclesiastes is now put (with Graetz) in the time of Herod, a date which formerly seemed to Cheyne to be "absolutely excluded" (*Job and Solomon*, 1887, p. 271). In the *Bampton Lectures* (1891) he found intimations of the belief in immortality in a series of Psalms (xvi., xvii., xlix., lxxiii.); he now thinks that "a strict textual criticism" compels us to abandon this theory. I must confess that I was not convinced by the former argument; but of the validity of the veto of text-criticism I am as little convinced.

The picture of the religious life of the Jews given in these lectures is far from complete. A very disproportionate space is given to the ethical and philosophical side, while others of equal or greater importance, such as the continued development of the law, and the process by which, in the course of these centuries, the Jews were converted into the people of the law, are not touched upon; an institution of as great moment as the Synagogue receives no mention. The crisis which contact with Greek civilization brought is only incidentally referred to.

One or two minor points may be noted. On page 204 n.†, as evidence that Ben Sira was a Sadducee, it is remarked that "the Books of the Sadducees and the Book of Ben Sira are placed side by side on the old Jewish Index Expurgatorius. See *Sanhedrin*, 100 b." "Sadducees" in this passage is a change made by the censorship; the original reading was *mīnīm*, "sectaries," *i. e.*, Jewish Christians; the oldest form of this

"Index" expressly names the Gospels. On page 201 n.* "bedchamber" is a slip of the pen for "couch."

GEORGE F. MOORE.

Ave Roma Immortalis. Studies from the Chronicles of Rome. By FRANCIS MARION CRAWFORD. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1898. Two vols., pp. x, 332; ix, 344.)

DURING this generation we have become so accustomed to the prevalence of the artistic and archaeological elements, in new books on Rome, that *Ave Roma* comes with the advantage of novelty in its unexpected treatment of a well-worn subject. At the same time a great deal will be required of the author because of his long residence in Rome, his well-known familiarity with the theme, and his reputation as a writer. In its general elements, Mr. Crawford has produced the kind of book to be expected of a writer of fiction, who seeks for characteristic facts and settings, delves into the past as well as the present to find them, and when found proceeds, in order to compose his picture, to strengthen their tragic outlines or to invest them with the rich colors of a poetic fancy. Accustomed to gather material for his fiction among the very kinds of people he paints for us in this book, his aim is to portray the life of Rome at its great periods, both in its general phases and its special dramatic incidents. He would not care—even were he able—to cast his stray anecdotes and disjointed essays into a connected whole; that would be the work of a scholar, whereas his aim must surely have been to write a readable popular book, without pretense of making it systematic or learned.

The arrangement, though it may at first seem peculiar, is really necessitated by these characteristics. It commences with some introductory essays of historico-pictorial content. "The Making of the City" (I.) sketches somewhat dreamily the legends and primitive life, though without reference to Latins or Sabines, tribes or form of government, and then refers to the establishment of the republic and the wars with Pyrrhus and Carthage. Under "The Empire" (II.), after some preliminary character-sketching of the Gracchi, Marius and Sylla, there follows a detailed eulogy of Julius Caesar as the greatest man that ever lived, and a somewhat frigid estimate of Augustus. Then the entire imperial period is dismissed with the summary explanation that it was created and directed by the army and undermined by Christianity and the barbarians. "The Rome of Augustus" (III.) is a chapter from which we expect great things until we find that it consists of an essay on Horace and his famous walk with a bore. Even that disappointment hardly prepares us for the absence of the medieval in the following chapter (IV.), entitled the "Middle Age," largely devoted to a discussion of the tyrannical power of the father in the ancient Roman family.

Whereupon the author, imagining that the historical antecedents are presented and the ground satisfactorily cleared, introduces the main body of the book, treating of Rome topographically under the headings of the fourteen *rioni,* the regions into which the medieval city was divided, each organized under its captain and banner into a force representing the Roman people as distinct from the papal court and the barons. Each *rione* is discussed in turn, some building being often made the peg on which to hang a story, nearly always of the late Middle Ages or the Renaissance, for of classic or early Christian stories Mr. Crawford is extremely chary.

There are popular festivals of olden time, such as the *Coromania,* the warding of the witches, or the Carnival; public ceremonies, like the imperial coronations and the processions; tragic incidents, such as the fratricides of the Mattei family or the Orsini and Colonna feuds; character-sketches of great men like Arnold of Brescia and Rienzi; descriptions of a period or state of society, like the life of the medieval barons, of the Roman nobles and their households in the Renaissance, or of the Jews in the old Ghetto. The most satisfactory treatment of a single *rione* is that of the Capitol (Campitelli), with its dream-pictures of life in the imperial forum and contests in the Coliseum, and with its pen-pictures of medieval revolutions clustering about the old Capitoline fortress and the Ara Coeli.

After ending his topographical trip for anecdotes at the threshold of the Vatican, Mr. Crawford closes with three somewhat systematic chapters on Leo XIII., the Vatican and St. Peter's. His sketch of the great pope is sympathetic and masterly, and for the rest he aims to give, here as elsewhere, impressionistic effects of atmosphere and personality rather than descriptions of things.

This is the subject-matter of the book. As for the manner of the telling, one feels almost at every point the hand of a dexterous artist in word-combinations and scenic effects, able to conjure up life-like scenes; in fact in many episodes the colors are laid on rather heavily and the style sustained at so high a tension that it is as if one were invited to dine off caviare alone; one would welcome more frequent recourse to easier diction to relieve the strain.

The impression that the book leaves will depend on the class to which the reader belongs. The average reader is likely to sum it up as a sheaf of well-told dramatic stories, pen-portraits and essays, loosely bound together by an easy narrative. He will not care to enquire whether there is logic in the arrangement, completeness and due proportion in the picture, or perfect accuracy in the details, provided he is kept interested and imbued with local color—as he surely is.

On the other hand, the lover of Rome, familiar with the details of its past without being a specialist, will be charmed by the vivid presentation of many things he knows, but he will also miss much that is vital: he finds but little that relates to such themes as the rich life of imperial Rome; the early Christians, their catacombs and churches; the transformation scenes by which the ancient passed into the medieval city; the monastic and religious Rome of the past with the pageantry of the papal court; medieval art and its countless memorials; the life and work in the city of the great artists of the Renaissance, or even the literary life of the humanists and their successors of the "Arcadi" and "Lincei." Were such a lover of Rome taxed with unreasonableness in demanding so much, he might declare that such things should have been substituted for much gossipy padding and irrelevant matter; such as the attempt to portray in fifty pages the origin, technique and history of various branches of Italian art—especially painting—during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Regarding this essay, tucked in at random under the *rione* of Trastevere—one cannot see why—the familiar question spontaneously occurs: "*Que fait-il dans cette galère?*" What have the literary landmarks of Rome to do with Cimabue and Mantegna and the Tuscan revival, especially when the author consistently omits any discussion of works of art in Rome?

Finally the average specialist, disappointed in his search for new information or for scholarly study or presentation of sources, would probably seek to determine whether the well-known facts here used are presented with accuracy and the conclusions drawn in a trustworthy manner. As he turns the pages he will find it said that Rome kept on growing in power after the expulsion of the Tarquins; that it was the Roman army that set on the throne such emperors as Tiberius, Trajan, and Marcus Aurelius; that the Latin of the mass was the Latin of the Roman slaves; that the feudal system and castes and the medieval guilds developed from the tyranny of the ancient Roman father; that up to the eleventh century the bishops of Milan, Naples and other Italian cities commonly called themselves popes, much to the distress of the Roman pontiff; that in the churches the *confessio* (really the place under the altar containing the relics of the martyrs) was the altar-rail (!), because the confession was made there—an original explanation of the author. These statements would suffice to bring tears to the glassiest historic or archaeological eye and make our specialist devoutly thankful that the author was not oftener inveigled out of the simple field of anecdote into the more perilous path of general historic causes and conclusions.

Of these three opinions the amiable verdict of the average reader would seem the fairest, as the book was evidently written for his benefit. Even thus we cannot echo the sentence of one reviewer, that Rome has been long waiting for its literary historian and is fortunate in having at last secured him in Crawford. Entertaining and rich in varied interest as *Ave Roma* certainly is, it but makes more evident the fact that Rome still waits for an unwritten book that shall unfold the endless scroll of the entrancing story of its life—or rather of its several and contrasting lives—by some man capable of handling all the material, yet of so living in the past as to subordinate it to the vital human interest, and capable also of painting word-pictures with colors mixed on the palette of truth and perception.

It is certainly not lack of material that has kept this dream unrealized. For all but the pre-imperial period contemporary documents abound. The "Chronicles of Rome," whatever may be meant by this vague term in Mr. Crawford's sub-title, seem to be claimed as sources for his book, and yet he would be the first to disclaim having approached them at any but a respectful distance, through the eyes of modern writers like the "learned Baracconi," whose book on the Regions of Rome he follows in his arrangement and often quotes in his stories. What a wealth of anecdote could he not have garnered had he been a historian instead of a *raconteur*, and gone to the "Chronicles;" connecting the pages of ancient Roman history with the relics of the city, weaving around churches, monasteries and streets the magic of early and medieval legends and stories from the Lives of the Saints, from the "Liber Pontificalis" and old historic texts to whose plain accounts he could have lent the magic of life and color!

A. L. FROTHINGHAM, JR.

Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte. Herausgegeben von der Kirchenväter-Commission der königl. preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. *Hippolytus Werke.* Erster Band. Exegetische und homiletische Schriften. Herausgegeben . . . . von G. NATH. BONWETSCH d. u. o. Professor der Theologie in Göttingen und HANS ACHELIS, Privatdozent der Theologie in Göttingen. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs. 1897. Pp. xxviii, 374; x, 309.)

PATRISTIC research stirs in many a religious reformer an echo of the old complaint: Earthquakes in Lisbon *et l'on danse à Paris!* Such an impatient spirit should heed the prescription for flagging religious zeal offered by so bold a scorner of dead tradition as Paul de Lagarde. Whatever success Germany has had in politics, he declared, sprang from the documents of the *Monumenta Germaniae*, and the great advance in knowledge of ancient history, philosophy, and language was due to the men who gathered Greek and Latin inscriptions or issued the Berlin text of Aristotle. "An edition of Origen, of the various Parallela Sacra, of Cyril of Jerusalem, of Makarius and the Fathers of the desert, of the great scholastics, would affect religion as those monuments affected patriotism, as the Berlin Aristotle and the *Corpora* affected the philology of the ancient languages" (*Memoir*, p. 175). This opinion lends interest to a great undertaking of German scholarship the first fruits of which are presented in the volume here considered.

In 1891 a Church-Father Commission was appointed by the Prussian Academy of Sciences to collect and publish all the literary monuments in Greek, except the New Testament, of the earliest Christianity and the growing Catholic Church to the time of Constantine. Even late Jewish works of Christian currency or Christian redaction are to be included and wherever the Greek original fails the ancient translations will be given. The execution of this project has been aided by an endowment belonging to the Academy: the Hermann und Elise geborene Hackmann Wenzel-Stiftung. The series will be complete in some fifty volumes and will be finished in twenty years. That vast labor and restless enthusiasm have been called into play is evident by the two massive volumes of the History of Early Christian Literature edited by Adolf Harnack as a guide to the enterprise and by the studies in literary history now appearing from the pens of the editors and others in the *Archiv für die älteren christlichen Schriftsteller*. Were Lagarde alive he might complain again of the intolerable monopoly of the Berlin Academy. His comfort would have been the fact that the first volume is the work of scholars in Göttingen, Bonwetsch and Hans Achelis.

The series opens proudly, for this first volume is more than a critical edition of familiar matter. The first part is an *editio princeps* of Hippolytus's Commentary on Daniel. This very early exegetical work with its riotous typology having been superseded by Theodoret's commentary, only scattered fragments were accessible, until in 1885 Georgiades published the whole of Book IV. Although much of the Greek is still missing completeness is now obtained by the translation into German of an Old Slavic version. Where the Greek is preserved some peculiarities of the Slavic appear. In IV. 15 we read of revelations in dream of the speedy approach of the Advent causing the brethren to neglect their farms. When the prediction proved to be erroneous, the Greek informs us, maidens married and the men went to their husbandry. According to the Slavic version, the nuns married and the monks took wives. Chronology had few problems to the medieval scribe.

The rest of Bonwetsch's contribution is a collection of fragments on the Song of Songs, one in Greek, the rest in German translations from Slavonic, Armenian and Syriac sources. The second half of the volume, edited by Achelis, consists of the tract on Antichrist and a mass of exegetical and homiletic fragments, not all in Greek and certainly not all genuine.

The text of Hippolytus is evidently a complicated problem and it is far from clear that the fuller provision of manuscripts has enabled the editors to present a more accurate text than Lagarde printed. His edition is not wholly supplanted. The omissions of the Chigi fragment of the commentary on Daniel are now made evident; but as they were mostly omissions of Daniel's text or material from I. Maccabees the simplicity of the Chigi text in some important passages is not therefore rendered suspicious. In the case of Dan. iv. 23, Bonwetsch prints the fuller text with the date of Christ's birth as December 25, but the note accepts the reading of the Chigi fragment as more original, a reading without the Christmas date. It seems clear that amplification and embellishment, though not doctrinal interests, have been motives at work. A passage from De Antichristo III. may illustrate Lagarde: "I beseech you to strive with me in supplication to God. You seek to get (learn) how of old the Word of God, himself again the servant of God, of old the Word, gave revelations to the blessed prophets." Achelis: "I beseech you also, Theophilus, to strive with me in supplication to God, in order that what of old the Word of God revealed to the blessed prophets, now himself again the servant of God, being of old the Word but now also manifested in the world for our sakes as a man, He may make clear to you through us those things which you seek to get through prayer to Him." Syntax and context suggest interpolation.

Doubtless special studies in doctrinal history will be evoked by this publication. The narrow but fervid interest here shown in the realistic notion of a physical redemption prepares the student for a proper appreciation of Augustine's influence over Western religion.

F. A. Christie.

Die Christenverfolgungen im römischen Reiche vom Standpunkte des Juristen. Von Dr. Max Conrat (Cohn), Professor des römischen Rechts an der Universität Amsterdam. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs. 1897. Pp. 80.)

Upon such a subject as the persecutions of the early Christians a professor of Roman law should be particularly qualified to speak, and the author of the present work may be assured of a respectful hearing from all students of ancient church history. The advantage that may accrue from approaching the matter from the standpoint of Roman law was shown by the notable article by Professor Mommsen in the *Historische Zeitschrift* for 1890, entitled "Der Religionsfrevel nach römischem Recht." That article completely revolutionized traditional conceptions touching the causes of the persecutions and the methods of procedure against the Christians. Professor Conrat acknowledges his indebtedness to Mommsen's article, upon which his own work is based, but he has evidently done careful and independent work in the sources and he believes that he has reached new and important results. We regret that we are unable to agree with him in that belief. His book has a distinct value because of the numerous quotations from the sources and the elaborate discussions in the notes, but we fail to see that he has contributed anything of importance to our knowledge of the subject. Indeed it seems to us that at some points his treatment marks a distinct step backward.

The author is undoubtedly correct in taking the position that no general law or imperial edict against Christianity is necessary to account for the persecutions and that no such law was passed or edict published during the first two centuries of the Church's life. But when he attempts to find the cause of the persecutions in the actual or alleged violation by the Christians of some other specific law or laws or in their commission of some specific crime he is certainly on the wrong track. He refers in a note to the extraordinary police jurisdiction of the Roman governors—upon which Mommsen rightly lays stress—but he fails to recognize its bearing upon the subject in hand. Thus he says on p. 21 that it is certain "dass die Zugehörigkeit zum Christenthum als solche bez. das Christenthum als solches niemals verboten *und darum niemals verfolgt resp. bestraft worden ist.*" The conclusion of this sentence (the italics are ours) indicates an entire misapprehension of the real situation. As a matter of fact, though Christianity was not forbidden by the state, Christians were frequently punished, from the time of Nero on, because they were Christians. The possibility of such an apparently anomalous state of affairs lay in the fact that the Roman governors were charged with a large measure of administrative discretion and were empowered to proceed sharply against any who seemed to menace the public safety, even though they might be guilty of no violation of the statutes of the empire. It was apparently during the reign of Nero that the Christians came to be generally regarded as possessing that *odium generis humani* of which Tacitus speaks; and from that time on any governor might arrest and punish them at any time if he found them creating disturbances or believed that they were threatening the public welfare, even though they were guilty of no specific crimes, and this is what many governors did, among them the younger Pliny in Bithynia. Professor Conrat's failure to give due recognition to this aspect of the case has resulted in what seems to us a very serious misinterpretation of Rome's treatment of the early Christians.

A. C. McGiffert.

Petrarch, the First Modern Scholar and Man of Letters. A Selection from his Correspondence, designed to illustrate the Beginnings of the Renaissance. Translated from the original Latin, together with Historical Introductions and Notes. By James Harvey Robinson, Professor of History in Columbia University, with the collaboration of Henry Winchester Rolfe, sometime Professor of Latin in Swarthmore College. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1898. Pp. x, 436.)

This book will be gratefully received, not only by the lovers of the Renaissance, but also by that larger public which through all the changes of modern education has, from either loyalty or conviction, retained an affection for the old-fashioned humanistic ideals. The particular problem which the authors set themselves was the presentation of the character of that man, Petrarch, who led the fight for the rehabilitation, among the cramped society of the Middle Ages, of the liberating philosophy of the ancients. The method which they felicitously adopted in place of the usual tedious exposition was, to yield the floor, as it were, to Petrarch himself, by binding together in the frame of an able and lively commentary selected letters of the immense correspondence in which the great scholar has depicted himself, his aspirations, his environment, and his friends. A rapid glance suffices to master the arrangement of the material. An introduction of fifty-seven pages acquaints us with the man and the time; then follow the letters themselves ordered in divisions or rubrics calculated to bring out the significant features of Petrarch's life. These rubrics are as follows: I. Biographical, II. Petrarch and his Literary Contemporaries, III. The Father of Humanism, IV. Travels, V. Political Opinions: Rienzi and Charles IV., VI. The Conflict of Monastic and Secular Ideals, VII. Finale. This general plan will readily commend itself for its breadth and its clearness; nothing essential is left out, nothing obscured. As regards the details of the plan, however, one improvement might be introduced which would render a service quite out of proportion to the trouble it would take. As the case is, the reader can get information concerning the date, place, and correspondent only by a somewhat tedious see-saw among foot-notes, introductions, and epilogues, and he can discover the argument of a particular letter only by reading the whole of it. Certainly the authors would have indulged a legitimate desire for convenience, if they had prefaced every letter by a paragraph in small print, in which they furnished the desired information in a few compact sentences. Every letter would thus have been enveloped in its proper atmosphere through which one could have penetrated swiftly and commodiously into the heart of the document.

The authors of the book make no pretension to new facts, their task being, after the arrangement of the material had been once decided, the business of selecting, editing and translating. And this business, very largely one of tact and form, they have managed quite as satisfactorily as the general plan. Each division of the work, and each letter of each division, is set against just the amount of background requisite for the effectiveness of the contents, and of these carefully staged backgrounds, scholarship, precision and artistic measure are conspicuous characteristics. However, two sources of irritation, the one less, the other more important, may be noted. Regarding the unimportant stricture, the authors occasionally indulge in repetitions, which they would presumably beg to have excused on the ground of clearness. The other matter, although it is only a stylistic vice, is more serious, since it involves the intelligibility and forcefulness of the whole argument. Throughout the longer excursions, and therefore particularly in the first Introduction, no effort is made to bind the various and often disparate information together by means of gradual transitions from paragraph to paragraph, and the consequence is that there is produced a wholly unnecessary effect of confusion, involving a suspicion of the capacity of the authors for development and climax. The Englished letters, which form of course the bulk of the volume, seem to satisfy admirably the demands of a good translation: they give not only the facts, but also the very style of dress in which Petrarch sent his facts out into the world. Certainly the easy, rippling, and—it must be confessed—occasionally long-winded period of the translations, in which force is persistently sacrificed to rhythmic swing and elegance, is modeled with sensitive precision upon the sentence-form of that writer who passionately strove to recover a fluent and suave latinity. Whether we are attracted or repelled by the style of these translations, they contain a great deal of the specific quality of the old humanist.

And finally, to turn from the details to the whole. The book is, considering its size, astonishingly full of information, and information, too, that never hobbles on crutches. The Middle Age therein becomes vital and intelligible; and above all, the figure of Petrarch gradually detaches itself from the pages with an actuality and an intimacy that commends him to our affections. Of course, there are sides of Petrarch that are deliberately slighted. Petrarch the poet, for instance, has no place in this volume; it is dedicated to the study of Petrarch the thinker and Petrarch the humanist. And this Petrarch will be found utterly worth while, undoubtedly one of the world's great leaders, who inspires our admiration when he makes his excursions into the uncertain realms of the intellect, and who claims our pity and tenderness when he falls victim to the medieval prejudices in his blood. It is interesting to observe how, much as in the case of the great intellectual pioneer of our own century, Goethe, the habits of scholarship gradually extinguished in him the fire of poetic invention, and it is delightful to note how in other respects, too, especially in his calm wisdom snd perfect balance, he resembles, not so much Erasmus and Voltaire, to whom he is usually likened, as the great thinker of Weimar. Indeed, the circumstance that the author of the passionate *Canzoniere* is also the parent of the learned Latin epic *Africa*, seems to throw some light on the famous riddle presented in the fact that the poet of the First Part of Faust is also the author of Part Second.

On the cover of the book appears a sketch of Vaucluse by Petrarch's hand—a most pleasant trifle, and really far more expressive than most of the landscape work of the fourteenth century. On page 87 Giotto is probably a slip for Simone Martini. The book is admirably free from careless mistakes.

FERDINAND SCHWILL.

Drake and the Tudor Navy, with a History of the Rise of England as a Maritime Power. By JULIAN S. CORBETT. (London, New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co. 1898. Two vols., pp. xvi, 436; viii, 488.)[1]

THIS book is, as its title suggests, not merely a biography of a sailor, who was, in the author's opinion, the foremost of the men who determined the direction and extent of a movement which made England a "controlling force in the European system by virtue of her power over the sea;" it is meant to be rather a history of the movement with Drake as the central figure—Drake, sea-rover, statesman, admiral, the "perfecter," Mr. Corbett claims, "of a rational system of sailing tactics," the "father of a sound system of strategy," the "first and unsurpassed master of that amphibious warfare which has built up the British Empire." In a word it is a lavish contribution to the history of the English navy based on wide reading of original and other sources, and illuminated throughout by brilliant constructive thinking.

As Mr. Corbett paints Drake's portrait upon the rich middle distance of Elizabethan maritime endeavor, so the history of Elizabeth's navy is in turn shown against a still broader background in the introductory essay on the naval art in the middle of the sixteenth century. It would perhaps be more prudent to rest content, at least till after maturer study, with simply calling attention to the great value of this introduction; but in a spirit not so much of criticism as of unassuming inquiry, I am inclined to ask a few questions, in the hope that, even though unjustified, they may serve to call attention to the important subject discussed.

---

[1] The following remarks apply to the first edition, possibly not always to a new edition which may have appeared before the present review.

The middle of the sixteenth century was a period of marked transition. The ideas of the Middle Ages held their dark sway over the sea a century after they had been banished from the land, but the cradle of the modern naval art, if I interpret rightly, was not the landlocked Mediterranean, but the wilder North Atlantic. From England, not from Italy, came the sailors' Renaissance. The great transition was, of course, from oars to sails, from the intricate mathematical tactics which handled a fleet of galleys with the precision of infantry and cavalry, to the simple line of sailing ships passing and repassing the enemy with serpentine ease, and pouring into him first one and then the other broadside, the afterwards so famous closehauled line-ahead, the invention of which Mr. Corbett is, I think, the first to assign to a date so early as the Armada year. And here, with some diffidence, I make the query whether it would have been possible, after describing the transition of warship and tactics, to discuss more fully the old Italian ideas of strategy. Perhaps a minute discussion of the Lepanto campaign would have served to emphasize still more sharply the great advance made in the naval art when, for the galley and galley warfare, the English substituted their own type of galleon, and their revolutionary sailing tactics and strategy. And, though not overlooking Mr. Corbett's remarks on the important ideas of Menendez, I am tempted, somewhat anticipating later chapters, to ask further whether one could not trace in greater detail an evolution of Spanish naval thought from Lepanto through the campaigns in the Azores to the Armada, an evolution which might perhaps correspond to the development of the famous Santa Cruz, who as a rowing-admiral commanded a squadron of galleys at Lepanto, as a sailing-admiral led a Spanish fleet to victory at San Miguel and at Terceira, and took a prominent part in the organization of the English Enterprise, though he did not live to lessen the disaster of 1588.

By a happy coincidence, the year that most clearly shows the transition from oars to sails was, Mr. Corbett thinks, probably the very year in which "the first great sailing-admiral the world ever saw came obscurely into being." His brilliant biographer carries us with Drake's boyhood "along the flood of religious passion," with his youth along the "more silent but no less deep and powerful flow of an aggressive and expanding commerce in search of new markets," and finally launches him upon his career as the great sailor of the Reformation. Mr. Corbett, however, does not permit his interest in the man to outweigh his interest in the navy. He has great naval lessons to teach, and does it with such skill and vigor that his most abstruse chapters could hardly lack fascination even for a platonic lover of history, while it is difficult to find in any historical work pages more thrilling than those which tell the deeds of the English sailors who burst through the barriers set up by the Pope into the fabulous new Spanish and Portuguese worlds of East and West, and filled their fearless heretic hands with the treasure that might have helped to make England, if not all Europe, Catholic and Spanish. I need not here discuss the details of this wonderful story, but shall doubtless be pardoned for lingering a little over Mr. Corbett's account of the Armada campaign. His discussion of the English strategy before the appearance in the channel of the Spanish fleet is important, and especially interesting to the curious in the history of tactics is his theory, which I have already mentioned, that the English fleet sailed in closehauled line-ahead in their first engagement with the Armada. Mr. Corbett's description of this first battle is very clear. His opinion that the English directed their fire chiefly to the weathermost point of the Spanish formation is a further contribution to the history of tactics. The description, modestly called by Mr. Corbett "the confused picture that it is possible to restore," of the Portland action is also a brilliant effort. His hypothesis in regard to Drake's movements is most interesting. To the change in the English fleet-formation resulting from this battle Mr. Corbett devotes a suggestive discussion. It was "the first attempt of the new school to formulate an order of battle suitable to their tactics," and it is interesting to find this new order emphasized in the description of the ensuing battle off the Wight. This description is perhaps not quite so happy as those of the first two actions. The theory that an attack by Hawkins and Drake upon the weathermost ships of the Spanish vanguard with a view to driving the whole Armada upon the Owers decided the day, is very taking, but I am not yet prepared to pass judgment upon it, nor upon the high estimate of the importance of this Wight action. Mr. Corbett's account of Gravelines again is very instructive. His original theory, however, that "the battle was on the eve of returning a harvest of prizes as rich as did Trafalgar, when suddenly, in the Spaniard's last extremity, a squall swept down . . . and changed the face of the day," does not yet convince me, but I may have overlooked some of the evidence in favor of it.[1] However, squall or no squall, Mr. Corbett thinks the English victory was complete enough, and mainly attributes the success to "a regular trained navy of specially built warships." It was "England who had the formal navy, not Spain, and it was the navy not the privateers that decided the campaign."

A discussion of the lessons taught England by the fight with the Armada serves admirably as an introduction to Drake's resolve to attack Lisbon, and the consequent expedition. To this famous "Portugal adventure," the "English Armada," which "ended almost as miserably as that of Spain," Mr. Corbett devotes a noteworthy chapter. But although the affair was regarded in England as a disastrous failure, he endorses Camden's opinion that England was in some respects a gainer from it, and maintains that "as a demonstration of the inherent weakness of Spain, which it had been Drake's life's work to teach his countrymen, it was final and complete."

---

[1] Some of my doubts are whether (cf. II. 289, n. 2) *aguacero* and *mollisnar*, or even the expression *entrar la mar* imply necessarily a dangerous wind, and whether (cf. II. 289, n. 1) *vuelta* does not apply to Medina Sidonia instead of to a squall. Mr. Corbett himself calls attention to "the complete silence of the English authorities on this squall."

To Drake, however, the Portuguese adventure brought disgrace, and in this way, as Mr. Corbett points out, proved a disaster to England. For in consequence of Drake's retirement the war "sank to mere commerce-destroying," a new state of things from which the lessons to be learned are "amongst the sharpest and most valuable" of the war. During these years of Drake's disgrace and the abandonment of his policy of offence, Spain grew constantly more powerful at sea, and England found herself at last confronted with the prospect of a new invasion still more formidable than the last. But Drake was finally recalled and thus we have the touching "Last Voyage," which, although over it hung the fatal ignorance that Spain had become a "great sea-power," nevertheless shows us the exact point to which Drake had carried the art of tactics at the moment of his death. "His work was done, his school was founded," and "even as he passed away, distraught with failure, England was fairly launched upon the course that brought her to the empire of the seas." I may perhaps be permitted to add to these closing words, that Mr. Corbett's book has so vividly emphasized the great lessons of Drake's career that the old drum at Buckland Abbey, which the legend says can summon him whenever England is in danger, need never beat again.

W. F. TILTON.

The Life and Letters of George Savile, Bart., First Marquis of Halifax, with a new edition of his Works now for the first time collected and revised. By H. C. FOXCROFT. (London, New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Company. 1898. Two vols., pp. xv, 511; vii, 587.)

THE thoroughness with which Miss Foxcroft has gone about her work lays students of English history of the period of the Revolution of 1688 under an indebtedness to her—an indebtedness greater than to any English woman who in recent years has engaged in historical research. Roughly speaking, three-fourths of the pages of Miss Foxcroft's two large volumes are occupied with the biography and letters of Halifax. The remaining one-fourth is given up to a collection of Halifax's political tracts and other writings; and in this department, that is as an editor, Miss Foxcroft has displayed the same industry and painstaking care as characterize the biography. The full and eventful political life of Halifax began in 1660, when, for the first and only time, he was of the House of Commons, as one of the representatives of the Yorkshire borough of Pontefract, in the Convention Parliament. Miss Foxcroft takes up Halifax's public career from this time, and goes with great fulness of detail into all its political actions, until his last speech in the House of Lords in opposition to the establishment of the Bank of England, a speech which was made only a few months before his death in April, 1695, when he had been twenty-eight years in the House of Lords.

While up to the time Miss Foxcroft wrote there was no adequate biography of Halifax, there was abundant material in the published letters and memoirs of the period from the Restoration to the beginning of the Hanoverian dynasty. Miss Foxcroft has drawn largely on this material. The Savile and Hatton correspondence, in the publications of the Camden Society; the Reresby memoirs, Clarendon's correspondence, Burnet's and Somerville's memoirs, to name only a few of the authorities of this period, have all been used to the utmost advantage. It is, in fact, almost impossible to name any authority, or any printed sources of information dealing with the last half of the seventeenth century which have escaped Miss Foxcroft's attention. She has drawn less than perhaps she might have done on the Journals of the English and Irish Parliaments and on the Statutes, and has frequently used Grey, Ralph and Luttrell, both in the text and in the numerous foot-notes to every page of the biography and the collected political pamphlets of Halifax, when she might with ease and advantage have gone to first authorities like the Journals and the Statutes. Both these sources are used, but scarcely to an extent in keeping with the extraordinarily wide range of Miss Foxcroft's research; for, throughout, Miss Foxcroft has shown no disposition to save herself work. A closer familiarity with the Journals of the House of Commons in the seventeenth century could hardly have failed also to have given Miss Foxcroft a better grasp than she appears to possess of the English system of parliamentary representation at the time of the Restoration and generally in the closing years of the seventeenth century. A lack of this full comprehension of the system as it then existed, with all the anomalies and all the anachronisms which continued to characterize it until 1832, seems apparent in Miss Foxcroft's rather slight treatment of the attack upon the charters of the municipal corporations in 1682, in which Halifax, as Lord Privy Seal, necessarily had an official share. Familiarity with the Journals of the House of Commons would also have prevented Miss Foxcroft from making the mistake she does in the footnote to Halifax's famous tract, "Some Cautions Offered to the Consideration of Those Who are to Choose Members to Serve in the Ensuing Parliament." She there states that "the number of 'pocket boroughs' in Cornwall, created by the Crown toward the end of the Stuart period, is a well-known fact." The "end of the Stuart period" is a rather vague term. Even if it is taken as dating from the Restoration, Miss Foxcroft is utterly wrong; for only one borough was given parliamentary representation by the Crown after 1660. This was Newark, which was practically a a pocket borough of the Saviles, and, as Miss Foxcroft brings out, was long represented by Henry Savile, Lord Halifax's brother. Familiarity with the Journals as close as with the other printed matter that Miss Foxcroft has handled so well, would also have obviated the footnote on the same page in respect to Halifax's use of the term "a man of the robe." Miss Foxcroft says that Johnson gives no example of this expression. In the Journals it occurs scores of times, to designate the lawyers who were of the House. Scarcely an important committee was named in the seventeenth century which was not made to include "Gentlemen of the Long Robe." One is inclined to wonder that Miss Foxcroft did not pursue the parliamentary side of her subject a little further; for Halifax was one of the earliest pamphleteers in the cause of parliamentary reform. His "Cautions to Electors" is one of the best contemporary pictures extant of the House of Commons, as it existed at the time of the Restoration. Under its twenty headings are set out faults in the representative system which Parliament was finally called upon to remedy in 1832 and continued to remedy by piecemeal legislation until 1835, and set out in a way that might have stimulated Miss Foxcroft's zeal in historical research.

If Miss Foxcroft has not pushed her research among printed material quite as far as she might have done with advantage to the setting in which she places Halifax, and to the value of her footnotes, she has made extensive and excellent use of manuscript sources. She has evidently been thorough in her work on the numerous reports of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, and having discovered much material of value there, she has not contented herself with the summaries and selections of the Commission's examiners and reporters; but has gone herself to the manuscript sources. One result of this industry is the recovery of a large number of Halifax's letters, almost as many as there are in the *Savile Correspondence* of the Camden Society. Another result is a free and helpful use of what are now known as the Devonshire House Notebook and the Spencer House Journals, both written by Halifax. The Journals, in fact, are both cited in the text and printed in their entirety as an appendix to the chapter covering the period with which they deal. The manuscripts in the British Museum, those in the State Paper Office, and those in the Bodleian Library, have also been exhaustively examined; so have the Longleat and other private collections, with the result that Miss Foxcroft has recovered and printed everything that Halifax wrote which is now extant, and which throws any light on his career.

At two or three places in the text, Miss Foxcroft distinctly states that she is not writing a history of the Restoration and Revolution periods. But her setting for the biography of the "Trimmer" is full and self-contained, and adequate for any student of these periods. She is an admirer of Halifax, and whether consciously or unconsciously shows a fondness for bringing him out of most difficulties, complications and compromising situations with flying colors. Halifax is to remain under no stigma which Miss Foxcroft's research can remove. She is as ready to remove a slur on Halifax's domestic morals as she is zealous to show that his attitude towards religion was not that so long imputed to him, or to show that he did not insist on dealing with the Popish Plot in 1679 utterly heedless of the truth regarding it; to clear him of any originative and active part in the attack on the charters of the municipal corporations in 1682; to free him from Macaulay's charge of voluptuousness, and from Dalrymple's charge of evincing that "indetermination of spirit which commonly makes literary men of no use in the world." Or again she tries to put Halifax clear of the intrigues of Admiral Russell with the Prince of Orange shortly before the birth of the Prince of Wales in 1688; to repudiate Ranke's charge of political supineness at the time when the London clergy were coming to their decision with respect to the promulgation in the churches of the second Declaration of Indulgence in May of the same year; to justify his part in the Hungerford negotiations, when the Prince of Orange was marching on London; or, to quote another and the last of what might be made a long list of examples, to make clear that Halifax was in no way responsible for the long delay which occurred in 1689 in bringing about the reduction of Ireland.

With regard to Halifax's moral delinquency, Miss Foxcroft is ingenious. "Besides his legitimate descendants," she writes, "the Marquis, it has been generally supposed, left at least one illegitimate son. Henry Carey, the poet, grandfather of Edmund Kean, is said to have professed himself the offspring of the Marquis of Halifax; he gave all his children the baptismal name of Savile, and report assigned to him a pension at the hands of the Savile family. As Carey, however, eighteen years after the death of his reputed father, described himself as still 'very young,' a phrase which then bore a less extended significance than at present, it may be doubted whether confusion has not arisen between the Marquis and some other member of the Savile connection." And to add to this doubt, Miss Foxcroft cites in a footnote a codicil made by the second Marquis of Halifax on his deathbed, August 21, 1700, by which the estate of the Marquis was charged with £55 yearly to be disposed as he had directed by word of mouth to the Earl of Nottingham and Mr. Conyers. These quotations are characteristic of the consistent care which Miss Foxcroft shows throughout her biography for Halifax's reputation in both public and private life. As regards the general character of the Marquis, and his place in the history of the Revolution, Miss Foxcroft offers no estimate. The scheme of her work, she adds, precludes any formal attempt at analysis. But no student will regard this as a shortcoming, for Miss Foxcroft has dealt so fully and so much in the spirit of a student with all the more important events and crises in Halifax's life, from the Exclusion controversy to the death of Queen Mary, that in respect to them it has been made possible for every student to gauge Halifax by the standard that President Fisher of the American Historical Association set up at the recent meeting at New Haven, and answer for himself "In a crisis, did this man cast his lot on the right side, and was he unselfish and brave?" In the greatest crisis of all, when at the last stage Halifax threw in his lot with the Revolution, time has long ago proved that he was right.

It is not always possible to congratulate Miss Foxcroft on the easy flow of her narrative; she has a proneness to italics which is irritating, and adds no strength to her writing. Many of the footnotes are trivial, and many others could with advantage have been embodied in the text; and while there is an index so full and complete that it extends over forty pages, a bibliography is lacking. To students, however, these are minor drawbacks, excepting perhaps the absence of a bibliography; and they do not to any appreciable extent reduce the indebtedness students are under to Miss Foxcroft for a biography and a collection of letters and political tracts, which will always rank among the most serviceable books of the Revolution period, and demand a place alongside the best of those drawn upon in her work.

EDWARD PORRITT.

Introduction à l'Histoire Littéraire. Par P. LACOMBE, Inspecteur Général des Bibliothèques et des Archives. (Paris: Hachette. 1898. Pp. viii, 420.)

THIS book is a collection of essays on certain aspects of French literature and of French literary criticism rather than a comprehensive view of the study of literature in general. The author himself, to be sure, is convinced that, as Aristotle based his system of *poetics* exclusively upon a consideration of Greek poetry, so the modern science of literature might be based, to a large extent at least, upon the accurate study of the literature of a single people. Or, to quote a comparison used by M. Lacombe himself, as the physicist is assured that an apple falls vertically to the ground in an unexplored country no less than in his own garden, so he, without having studied Arab, Chinese or Hindu literature, feels nevertheless assured that these literatures are governed essentially by the same laws of thought and expression as the literature of his own native country. Without entering here upon the question whether this comparison does not disclose a somewhat mechanical conception of literary problems, one cannot help regretting that a critic of such rare acumen and originality as M. Lacombe should not have extended his observation to wider fields; that he should not have attempted a comparative study of at least the principal literatures of ancient and modern Europe. A book which fails to bring before us at least the general trend of the literary development of the great nations of the world's history, can hardly be called an introduction to the study of literature.

Within the limits set to it by the author's fundamental self-restriction, the book contains a great variety of keen reflections and brilliant suggestions. It is essentially the work of a thinker; and in these days when the domain of literary investigation is well-nigh monopolized by the compilers, it is a genuine pleasure to meet a man who is earnestly in search of first principles. The contrast between this book of M. Lacombe's and a recent German production of a similar scope, Professor Elster's *Prinzipien der Literaturwissenschaft*, is indeed striking. While

Elster's work impresses one as a scrap-book of a vast amount of detached facts and isolated theories, Lacombe's one aim appears to be to reduce a limited number of observations to a rational whole.

Truly delightful reading is the chapter devoted to the psychological analysis of the artistic temper, the unravelling of the mysterious threads that connect the artist's work with his own personality, from the instinctive impulse for production to the conscious striving for definite effects, from unquestioning acceptance of the common modes of thought and feeling to uncompromising assertion of the artistic self. Masterly is the logical analysis of the complexity of causes that produce a given literary phenomenon such as the growth and decay of certain branches of poetry, of certain intellectual and emotional movements; and equally masterly is the way in which this analysis is applied to concrete historical examples, as for instance the development of classical French tragedy. Penetrating and true is the criticism of Taine's failure to explain the relation of the individual to the surrounding *milieu*, of Brunetière's brilliant but futile play with general terms such as *esprit anglais* or *moyen âge*. And full of significance is M. Lacombe's conception of the individual as "un événement qui porte en lui des traces d'institutions antérieures et qui est le point de départ d'institutions subséquentes." It is a pity that the author should not have made this conception the guiding principle of his discussion of literary progress. By tracing in detail the line of development formed by the constant interweaving of individual with institutional forces he would have deepened our insight into the causes that control the growth of a given literature a great deal more than by his interesting attempt to demonstrate the tendency of advancing civilization to increase the mastery over literary form and to heighten the capacity for poetic representation of a complex inner life.

Perhaps the most felicitous part of the whole book consists in the numerous characterizations of individual authors such as Racine, Rousseau, Voltaire, Byron, Chateaubriand, Hugo, Renan, every one of these sketches being used as illustration of some general principle. The very quality which seems to debar M. Lacombe from divinatory appreciation of poetry—his intensely analytic and rational temper—makes him a most fair-minded and unprejudiced interpreter of human nature.

KUNO FRANCKE.

La Philosophie Sociale du XVIII^e Siècle et la Révolution. Par ALFRED ESPINAS, Professor à l'Université de Bordeaux. (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1898. Pp. 413.)

THIS is a volume of lectures, several of them the opening lectures of annual courses delivered at Paris under the auspices of the Faculty of Letters. The author gives them in their original form, even to the extent of preserving the polite "Messieurs" at the outset of each. One feels hesitant in offering a critical judgment of them, conscious that in those to which they served as an introduction the positions here defended may have been more clearly defined. The only subject fully treated is the conspiracy of Babeuf, to which half the volume is devoted.

The volume opens with a discussion, from the psychological point of view, of the instinctive tendencies or activities of man in society. This is followed by a theory of social crises, an explanation of the social philosophy of the eighteenth century, and an argument to prove that the Revolution was essentially socialistic. The lectures on Babeuf complete the demonstration of the thesis which gives unity to the whole.

This thesis states that socialism was "un des facteurs de la Révolution française, dont la conspiration de 1796 est l'épilogue naturel." Babeuf is no bizarre revolutionary curiosity, therefore, he "continue et achève Robespierre." Support for this thesis is not sought in new documents, but in a new interpretation of documents already published.

M. Espinas acknowledges that the Revolution did result in the consolidation of individual property, and that at the distance of a century it does not seem to us particularly socialistic. But this was due, he thinks, to a stupid popular error, which arose after Bonaparte had declared there were to be no more readjustments of property rights, and which transformed the constitutional right of every man to *some* property, into a right to defend the property he had already acquired. And so arose the "legend of the good, the beneficent Revolution, the founder of individual property," a legend which even economists like Dupont de Nemours were not ashamed to strengthen because of the prestige the Revolution still possessed.

The author looks back upon the years between 1789 and 1795 as a time when the dreamer, the mischief-maker, and the spoiler, had control, and were actually retarding the progress of reform.

His pages give evidence of a careful examination of those debates, in the three assemblies, which bore upon the theory of property or which resulted in some modification of existing property rights. His defect, if defect there be—and those who take his point of view may observe no defect—is in his interpretation of Revolutionary utterances. For example he does not sufficiently distinguish between pious opinions on the welfare of society which the sentimental politicians of that day loved to express in the ardors of controversy, and measures which they embodied in legislation and which they actually carried out. Merely because they denounced riches as a source of corruption, and pictured some idyllic state of equality as the ideal toward which the legislator should work, we are not to infer that they had any serious intention to abolish riches or promote communism. Even Robespierre, more inclined than most others to hark back to principles, declared emphatically, in the debate on the declaration of rights, April 24, 1793, that equality of goods was a chimera, and added that it was even less necessary to private happiness than it was to the public welfare.

The author believes that the men of the Constituent were influenced by socialistic ideas to nearly the same degree as the Jacobins of 1793. Had this been the case one would suppose that they would have used the church lands to some better purpose than in immensely strengthening the cause of private property by increasing the number of individual holdings. Even M. Espinas is not unconscious of the difficulties of his thesis at this point, for he remarks, paradoxically, "le socialisme d'État était l'instrument avec lequel les derniers vestiges du communisme du moyen âge etaient effacés." Doubtless the way in which feudal rights were confiscated, and the lands of the church taken over by the state, constituted a serious attack upon property, just such an attack as convinced socialists might have made; nevertheless it must be remembered: first, that the impulse to the acts of August 4th, and of the succeeding weeks, came originally from attempts on the part of peasant proprietors to rid their lands of what seemed to them antiquated and unjust encumbrances; and secondly, that the secularization of the church lands had several aspects besides that of an act of socialistic expropriation; it was a financial expedient, a way of satisfying the land hunger of the peasantry, and a means of binding a host of new proprietors to the cause of the Revolution. Furthermore the whole was but the climax of tendencies which had been asserting themselves in French legislation ever since the feudal system had passed the zenith of its power.

When the author gets beyond the period of the Constituent he does not distinguish clearly between currents of opinion, and is inclined to use "Revolution" and "Robespierre" as interchangeable terms. The miscellaneous way in which he quotes them, regardless of what they stood for, would certainly convey a wrong impression to persons not tolerably familiar with the affiliations of such men as Chabot, Fouché and Joseph Le Bon.

Again he fails to make enough allowance for utterances suggested by no well-conceived theory of society, but suited rather to humor the bitter disappointments of the *sansculottes*; indeed the language of envy "lean with seeing others eat." Passions of this sort are often calmed by a little smashing of the social furniture.

But even if it be fair to use "Revolution" and "Robespierre" as synonyms, the author's interpretation of Robespierre is sometimes misleading. Take Robespierre's position on the freedom of bequest as an example. According to M. Espinas he was uncompromisingly opposed to granting any such privilege. And yet Robespierre says in the very speech from which M. Espinas quotes that he is in favor of pursuing a middle course, between the practice of those countries which grant unlimited liberty of disposing of property by bequest and that of those others where no such privileges are permitted. He thought the citizen could safely be allowed to will a portion of his property, provided the right were not used to perpetuate "cette trop grande inégalité des fortunes," which it should be the duty of the legislator to destroy.

Once more, where the argument concerns the right to work, which in the case of the feeble and the aged becomes the right to receive support, Robespierre and others are represented as holding that the larger portion of all property must be considered a reserve fund, to satisfy these claims.

Such an interpretation cannot fairly be put upon the words used in the debates. Neither did Robespierre argue that men who possessed property greater in amount than any individual's share in the common fund ought to be prosecuted as monopolists.

In the description of the conspiracy of Babeuf the attempt to create the impression that this ridiculous adventurer was a real continuator of Robespierre breaks down. He was a travesty, hardly more. And it is doubtful whether the ex-Jacobins, who allied themselves with him in their desire to restore the constitution of 1793, would have listened to his declamations if the victory had been won.

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that writers like M. Espinas are influenced in their interpretations by a subtle desire to discredit every phase of the Revolution. This comes from the unhappy fact that in France the Revolution is still "in politics."

HENRY E. BOURNE.

Pitt: Some Chapters of his Life and Times. By the Right Hon. EDWARD GIBSON, Lord ASHBOURNE. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1898. Pp. xiv,395.)

THIS work is rightly named "some chapters" in the life of Pitt. It is not a Life. The writer, Lord Ashbourne, the Chancellor of Ireland, has been a leading politician and is well qualified to give an opinion on any point of political history, especially when it relates, as the greater part of this volume does, to Irish affairs.

Pitt is a singular instance of a youth distinctly training himself for politics and turning out, without practical experience, a great politician. He went to Cambridge at fourteen and stayed there till he was twenty-one, leading a very studious and, during the earlier years, rather recluse life. Then entering Parliament, he at once took his place among the leaders; at twenty-three was a cabinet minister; and in his twenty-fifth year became prime minister and master of the House of Commons. He enjoyed the great heritage of his father's popularity, and he had been carefully trained by his father as a speaker. Curiously enough, he turned out the opposite of his father both as a statesman and as an orator. Chatham avowed himself a lover of honorable war; his glory was entirely warlike. He knew and cared little about economy or finance, and not much about general administration. His son was a disciple of Adam Smith, a financier, an economist, a lover of peace as the necessary condition of economical reform, and devoid of genius as a war minister. In his style of oratory also the pupil, though a success in his way, was the very opposite of his teacher. Chatham's style was in the highest degree original and electric. That of Pitt was in the strictest sense parliamentary. If any one wants to know what the perfection of British parliamentary eloquence is, let him read Pitt's speech of February 3, 1800, on the French overtures for peace. Fox's speech in reply, delivered immediately after Pitt had sat down, has been cited as a miracle of extempore effort. It is a wonderful speech, but Fox may easily have anticipated some of Pitt's points, enough to prepare the greatest passages, especially that about the character of the Bourbons.

Pitt's extreme youth when he went to the head of affairs, instead of repelling national confidence, appealed strongly to the national heart. The country, as Lord Rosebery has pointed out, was weary of the factions, cabals, self-seeking, corruption, and incapacity of the aristocratic connections, and of the train of calamities ending in the loss of the American colonies which they had brought upon the nation. The appearance on the scene of the young son of Chatham was felt as a dawn of fresh hope. The drawback was a stiffness of manner, arising from want of intercourse in boyhood with youthful companions, which clung to Pitt through life and probably did him no good; though too much stress has been laid upon "magnetism" as a qualification for leadership. A party will follow a very unmagnetic leader whom it thoroughly trusts. No one could be less magnetic than Lord Grey or Sir Robert Peel. Lord Ashbourne proves that the dictator, so high and haughty to his political associates, could unbend and be charming in a circle of intimate friends. Pitt is playing a boisterous game with some boys when two cabinet ministers are announced. He washes his face, which the boys had been corking, receives the two ministers with imperial dignity, and when they have departed resumes the game. The story is given in Bruce's *Life of Sir William Napier*.

It appears from Lord Ashbourne's chapter on Pitt's boyhood and youth that Pitt's domestic affections were strong, and that he was highly susceptible of home joys. But having given himself up to public life, he never seriously thought of marriage till he was thirty-eight, when he fell in love with Eleanor Eden, the daughter of Lord Auckland, whose house was near Holwood, the scene of Pitt's lonely life. It has been commonly supposed that Auckland, whose character was far from noble, forbade the marriage on the ground that Pitt was unable to make a settlement. Unable to make a settlement Pitt certainly was; for though his official income was not less than ten thousand pounds a year, and he had no vices or expensive tastes, the great finance minister had so neglected his own financial affairs and had been so plundered by his household that he was deeply in debt. But letters published by Lord Ashbourne show that it was not the father but the lover who drew back. See especially Pitt's letter of withdrawal, January 20, 1797, penned in his usual majestic style (p. 243).

To this Auckland replies in a letter which Lord Ashbourne says has been lost, but which evidently pleaded for reconsideration, showing that Auckland desired the match. Pitt rejoins with a still more decisive letter of withdrawal, not explicitly stating, but leading us to believe that the state of his finances was the cause. "The circumstances," he says, "of every man's private and personal situation can often on various accounts be fully and fairly judged of by no one but himself; even where, as in the present case, others may be interested in the result." The portrait of Eleanor Eden given in Lord Ashbourne's volume is very attractive. The marriage might have improved Pitt's habits and prolonged his life.

Lord Ashbourne fully discusses the famous FitzWilliam episode, over which there has been so much wailing and malediction. The anti-Revolutionary Whigs under Portland had coalesced with Pitt and the Tories. They were inclined, in accordance with the traditions of their party, to introduce into Ireland a more liberal system than that of government by Castle influence and patronage, as well as to make concessions to the Catholics. Pitt's personal tendencies were in the same line. But the Cabinet being divided, and the King being known to be hostile to concession, it was necessary to go cautiously to work. So, Lord Ashbourne seems to prove, FitzWilliam, on his appointment as viceroy, was clearly advised. But FitzWilliam, with the best of intentions, went very far from cautiously to work. He prematurely divulged his appointment and proclaimed the great things which he was going to do. On his arrival in Ireland he at once announced a total change of system, proceeded to dismiss the managers of the old machine, and threw himself into the arms of their opponents, thereby bringing down at once a storm upon his government. He certainly seems, as Lord Ashbourne says, herein to have contravened his instructions. His conduct was condemned by Portland, the leader of his own party; it was condemned by Lord Carlisle, his close and warm ally, distinctly, though in a letter of the gentlest and kindest remonstrance. FitzWilliam proceeded further to justify his recall by the exhibition of a great want of self-control, and by the unwarrantable disclosure of a confidential document. The disappointment, however, to the Irish Catholics was severe, and the general effect of the affair was calamitous; though we may agree with Lord Ashbourne in doubting whether any concessions to the Catholics in 1795 would have averted the catastrophe of 1798. In the whole discussion and treatment of the Irish problem undue importance was attached to the question of the Catholic disabilities, and unwarranted hopes were founded on the effect to be produced by their removal. The grievances which the people felt most were the oppressively high rents and the tithes. Lord Ashbourne is probably right in thinking that they cared little whether their representatives in Parliament were Catholics or Protestants. The fact is that in comparison of security in their holdings the Irish people cared very little and still care very little about parliaments at all.

Lord Ashbourne also discusses the charge brought against Pitt of breach of faith towards the Catholics in failing to carry Catholic Emancipation after holding out the hope of it as an inducement to Catholics to acquiesce in the Union. In the late fight about Home Rule extreme Gladstonians went the length of insinuating that Pitt had been guilty of detestable treachery, secretly speculating, when he held out the hope to the Catholics, on the King's prejudice as a door of escape from a moral pledge. But this could be believed only by those who are capable of believing that Pitt got up the Irish Rebellion in order to provide himself with a pretext for the Union. He had given no distinct pledge to Catholics, but he had unquestionably held out an expectation; and that expectation it was, not less unquestionably, his sincere desire to fulfill. Mr. Lecky, however, condemns him severely for his failure, and even Lord Ashbourne thinks that "he did not act in the matter like a strong man who meant to effect his purpose and who would not be denied." Lord Ashbourne suggests that Pitt's health was failing, and that he had lost some of the energy and decision of early days. That Pitt's health was failing is not doubtful. The port wine with which the family physician, Dr. Addington, had taught him to drench himself was doing its work, as had the colchicum with which the same medical adviser treated Chatham. But Pitt had strength enough several years afterwards to carry on the government and form a great coalition against Napoleon. There was another sort of weakness, not physical but political, which perhaps ought to be taken into account. Pitt owed the premiership in the first instance to a flagrant abuse of the royal influence, which was condoned by the nation from hatred of the coalition. This could hardly fail to weigh upon his mind whenever he was called upon to wrestle with the prejudices of the King. His intention was to follow up the Union not only with Catholic Emancipation but with the commutation of tithe and a provision for the Catholic clergy. But he had difficulty with his cabinet as well as with the King. That difficulty he seems to have judged it best first to overcome, that he might go to the King in the name of a unanimous cabinet. But he was betrayed by his Chancellor, the sycophant Loughborough, who, hoping to secure the King's favor for himself, disclosed Pitt's intention, and with the pious aid of two archbishops so bedevilled the half-insane conscience of his master that when Pitt approached the King the case was hopeless. Pitt paid the debt of honor by resignation. What more could he do? He could not give the King brains or sanity. He could not dethrone him, or deprive him of his legislative veto. George, moreover, had the decided sympathy of all the folly, ignorance, and bigotry of the nation on his side. Addington's administration was anti-Catholic, and Pitt is blamed for having supported it. But the Catholic question was secondary; the main question was the French war, in the midst of which the nation could not be left without a government. Pitt took a more questionable step when, a fit of the King's insanity having been brought on by the agitation, he spontaneously pledged himself not to moot the question of Catholic Emancipation again in the King's life-time. But as Lord Ashbourne says, there was at that time strong reason for believing that the King would not live long, and in the meantime Pitt did not, of course, renounce his chance of prevailing by persuasion, which would have been improved by this touching mark of consideration. To demand that when the war with Napoleon had been renewed and Addington's incompetence had become manifest, Pitt should refuse to answer to the call of the imperilled nation because he would not be able to proceed with a secondary measure, surely would have been preposterous. On that question the mind of the nation at all events was clear.

Lord Ashbourne has dealt with the previous Irish policy of Pitt, his efforts to bring about parliamentary reform and to give Ireland free trade in England. Pitt was evidently animated throughout by the same liberal spirit. That he was not so strong a man or so resolute in facing difficulties as has been commonly supposed is likely enough. But he was certainly incapable of perfidy and probably as little likely as any man who has ever held power can be, to be led away from the path of honor by the love of place.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

Bismarck: Some Secret Pages of His History. Being a Diary kept by Dr. MORITZ BUSCH during twenty-five years' official and private Intercourse with the Great Chancellor. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1898. Two vols., pp. xix, 504; viii, 585.)

PRINCESS BISMARCK, who, like most wives, gave her husband shrewd advice, warned the Prince of the dangers that lurked in Moritz Busch's ink-bottle. "The doctor," said she, "may be very clever and amiable, but all the same you should be on your guard at table when he is present. He always sits there with his ears cocked, writes everything down, and then spreads it abroad." Bismarck, however, knew very well the quality of Busch's literary gossip and was willing to stamp it with his official approval. In November, 1878, Dr. Busch published a book called *Count Bismarck and His People*, the important portions of which are incorporated in the work now before us. Bismarck himself revised the manuscript, and, after it was printed, told Busch that it would give fools the impression that Bismarck was a bitter, censorious, envious creature, unable to bear the vicinity of any greatness. Nevertheless, at the close of the same conversation, Bismarck told his Boswell "as soon as I am dead you can say whatever you like, everything you know." The Prince gave to Busch the use of important papers, and said, "One day long after my death Büschlein will write the secret history of our times from good sources." The doctor declared to the Prince, "I have always regarded myself as your little archer, who at your call would even shoot my bolt at the sun himself." The reader, therefore, may study these volumes with some assurance that the portrait of Bismarck therein contained is authentic as far as it goes.

There are in these memoirs three clearly distinct groups of materials of uneven value. First are the constantly recurring abstracts of the articles written by Busch, mostly at Bismarck's own dictation, for sundry newspapers at home and abroad.

The period of Dr. Busch's greatest activity as confidential secretary was from 1870 to 1873, but he continued to help Bismarck "tune the newspapers," especially after April, 1877, until the latter's retirement in 1890. These "inspired" editorials, once delivered to the public through the mouthpieces of the imperial government, relate to every phase of Bismarck's domestic and foreign policy. To the close student of Bismarck's statesmanship they will be of considerable service, as they will help him to guess at the real motives for some of the Chancellor's moves upon the political checker-board. They are of no value and of little interest to the general reader except as they reveal Bismarck's method of creating public opinion and Bismarck's notions of ethics. It seems surprising that in a country where newspapers count for so little, a statesman with so profound a contempt for popular opinion should have been eager to notice and combat obscure journalistic critics. Bismarck's journalistic battery, however, was most useful to him as a means of electrifying his friends in Vienna or his enemies in England or in the court circle around the Empress. The brain of Bismarck and the hand of Bismarck set the current in motion and then the wily Chancellor watched the resultant gestures. After the shock was once felt by the right party, Bismarck had no conscientious scruples about denying his own participation in the affair and roundly condemning his agents. So Busch in 1888 wrote at Bismarck's suggestion a stinging article against the two Victorias, which article Bismarck promptly, publicly and indignantly condemned. The doctor, who elsewhere says that Bismarck "thoroughly understood the business of journalism," was not much disturbed by Bismarck's apparent tergiversation. He wrote in his diary, "*Tempora mutantur?* But I shall never change towards him, nor he doubtless toward me." The members of Bismarck's Literary Bureau counted such sacrifices for their chief of little moment, and Busch thought none the less of his chief because the latter sometimes deceived or repudiated him. Busch was not one to love and serve in silence, however. "I said (to Bismarck) that I would let myself be cut to pieces for his sake; that as for me he was like one of God's prophets upon earth." On one page of his diary he compares Bismarck to "the god Odin," and on the next he writes "I am not disposed to question . . . that he must look back upon his deeds and creations with something of the feeling with which God the Father on the seventh day regarded the world He had made." Twice Busch records that he called Bismarck "Master and Messiah." Bismarck answered "Blasphemy? But you have deserved my confidence."

Such being the feelings of Busch towards his chief, it is obvious what opinions he would entertain of his associates who were not equally faithful. The second group of materials collected by him reveals the daily life of that little group of Bismarck's clerks and secretaries in the Foreign Office, as Busch saw and knew them. These passages have little value in so far as they are verdicts upon men who for the world at large are comparatively obscure, but they convey a vivid picture of daily life in a department of state. The third element in these volumes is the record of conversations with Bismarck, comprising about one-third of the whole work. Almost every line of it is full of lively interest. It has already become—and will remain—a storehouse of Bismarckian anecdotes and quotations. That the doctor is an accurate reporter in the main is more than probable. No one but Bismarck smote out these sledge-hammer sentences: Gagern is "a mere watering-can of fine phrases." "The Serene Highnesses fluttered around me (at Versailles) like crows round a screech-owl." "Bleichroeder must go into Paris immediately, smell and be smelt at by his brethren in the faith and discuss with the bankers how it is to be done" (payment of French indemnity). "These Parisians who boast of being the cream of civilization, but who in reality are merely the redskins of the pavement." "Professor Gladstone!" "That greenhorn Mommsen!"

The most common subject of Bismarck's monologues with his secretary or his table-companions was his relations with the principal members of the Hohenzollern family. It is surprisingly plain that Bismarck maintained no conventional fictions about the real depositary of supreme power. There is not the slightest trace of that ancient sentiment that caused Chatham to tremble in the presence of George III. Said Bismarck: "I have seen three kings in a state of nakedness and frequently these three exalted gentlemen did not make altogether a very good show. Still it would not do to say that openly before the world. . . . And yet I can just as little keep silent." While he worked he was both King and Emperor; when he could not rule, he resigned. These are the mutterings of a weary Titan, fretted because he must not use his strength beyond the powers of the royal weaklings with whom he was associated. William I. appears as a good-natured, childish dotard, whom Bismarck liked to play with and whom Bismarck periodically preserved from a propensity to tell lies and to fall under the baneful influence of the Empress-Queen Augusta. "The King wishes to see some newspapers and he wishes to have the most important passages marked. Mark some places in the *Nord-Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, it does not much matter what, and send me up the paper." "Nov. 29, 1870. The King told me an untruth to-day. He cannot lie . . . in such a way that it cannot be detected." "As he sits at work, Augusta sticks her head into the room and asks in a caressing voice, 'Do I disturb you?' When he, always gallant, replies 'No,' she comes in and pours out all sorts of insignificant gossip to him. . . . That is not love, however, but pure play-acting. . . . There is nothing natural about her—everything is artificial inwardly as well as outwardly." Again, in 1888, "He (William I.) usually began by taking the wrong road, but in the end he always allowed himself to be put straight again." Bismarck's attitude towards the Empresses Augusta and Victoria needs no illustration. For different reasons he constantly opposed each of them and he called them "snobs." "Whenever I performed on the political tight-rope they hit me on the shins, and if I had only fallen, how delighted they would have been." As to William's successor the Bismarck sentiment was clearly expressed by Busch. "After the death of the Emperor Frederick, I wrote to Bucher a few lines expressing the satisfaction I felt that we were relieved of that incubus, and that his place was now to be taken by a disciple and admirer of the Chief." As early as 1882 Bismarck spoke approvingly of the younger William. "He is not at all disposed to put up with parliamentary co-regents." In 1888 Busch notes Prince William's friendliness to the Chancellor thus: "What high appreciation and what modest self-suppression and honorable subordination on the part of the future Emperor! May God reward him for it! . . . But what does his mother think of it?" After William's accession Bismarck said (September, 1888) "He has more understanding, more courage and greater independence of court influences [than his grandfather], but in his leaning towards me he goes far." A year and a half later came the end. Bismarck burst out upon Busch, "I cannot stand him any longer. . . . I cannot tack on as a tail to my career the failures of arbitrary and inexperienced self-conceit for which I should be responsible."

Busch's stories make it as clear as day that Bismarck and young William were merely two emperors in one realm. A collision was inevitable unless the Bismarck dynasty was to supplant the Hohenzollerns. If a tithe of Bismarck's table-talk, as here reported, reached the Emperor's ears, he was indeed lenient and long-suffering with his great subject. Bismarck said: "For our gibing at princes, we ought each to have ten years of penal servitude."

It is evident that Bismarck had few friends with whom he met on equal terms. Secure in his self-confidence he permitted no rivals, admitted no equals. Scarcely a single contemporary of any rank is mentioned by Bismarck with hearty commendation. Some one quoted Goethe's verse,

"Selig wer sich vor der Welt
Ohne Hass verschliesst,"

and Bismarck exclaimed "Without hate! What a tailor's soul he must have!" Bismarck did confess to Busch that he had a weakness for Americans. This occurred at the time when Burnside and Phil Sheridan were visiting him, and Busch observes that the latter general particularly spoke "the purest Yankee dialect."

In this portraiture of the Chancellor there is no more striking and significant feature than Bismarck's frequent and sincere declarations of religious faith. There is a true Puritan flavor in his uniformly unquestioning belief that all his foes, domestic and foreign, are God's foes also. It is quite likely that this development of Bismarck's nature owed much to the influence of his wife, who wrote to him when he was before Paris, thus: "I fear you will not be able to find a Bible in France, so I shall shortly send you the Psalms, in order that you may read the prophecies against the French—'I tell thee, the godless shall be destroyed.'" When Bismarck was with the army he kept in his baggage and read habitually two Moravian manuals of devotion, *Daily Watchwords and Texts of the Moravian Brethren for 1870*, and *Daily Spiritual Refreshment for Believing Christians*. At the same time, at table, he discoursed at length upon trust in God, saying: "If I did not believe in a Divine Providence which has ordained this German nation to something good and great, I would at once give up my trade as a statesman or I should never have gone into the business. . . . A resolute faith in a life after death—for that reason I am a royalist; otherwise I am by nature a republican. . . . Sever my connection with God, and I am a man who would pack up to-morrow and be off to Varzin and say —— —— —— (too vulgar for print) and cultivate his oats. You would then deprive me of my King, because, if there is no Divine Commandment why should I subordinate myself to these Hohenzollerns? They are a Suabian family no better than my own, and in that case no concern of mine. Why should I be worse than Jacoby, who might then be accepted as President, or even as King? He would be in many ways more sensible, and at all events cheaper." Busch has in this passage undoubtedly preserved a lava-burst hot from the heart of the volcano. It contains not only Bismarck's creed, but his political philosophy too, equally simple in statement and broad in extent. He felt himself to be no mere king's-man such as Thomas Cromwell and Cardinal Wolsey were. He was on the side of a strong and permanent central authority because his religious faith told him that such is the law of the universe, and because he believed that a nation could be made strong only by conformity to this—the Divine plan of organization. On this account this man of "blood and iron" contended all his life against English ideas and against England, "rich, burly, full-blooded England," as he called it, and strove to exclude from the German system, so far as possible, the venom of English parliamentarism. "They hate and slander me because I am a Junker and not a professor. . . . I was born a Junker, but my policy was not that of the Junkers. I am a Royalist in the first place, and then a Prussian and a German. I will defend my King and the monarchy against revolution, both overt and covert, and I will establish and leave behind me a strong and healthy Germany." After thirty years of service Bismarck had so identified himself with Germany, had become so completely the man of destiny, that dismissal from office shattered his allegiance to the Germany external to himself, and he permitted himself to exalt the memory and the ideals of Emperor Frederick, an act which the faithful Busch records with grieved surprise.

It is probably safe to say that no one who, either as psychologist or political philosopher, wishes to know the real Bismarck, can leave these volumes unread. Nowhere else in the world now can the voice of Bismarck speak so frankly and clearly as here. Nor is it by any means only Bismarck the politician and minister of state who is revealed. Here is Bismarck quoting poetry,—Shakespeare, Goethe, Schiller. There he discusses pedagogics, asserting that he has forgotten the Latin and Greek that he once knew, and that learned men retain these languages in the schools because they are unwilling to lessen the value of what they have themselves laboriously acquired. As a substitute for Greek he proposes Russian, a language at once more difficult and more valuable. There are many glimpses of the purely human side of his nature. "The tears rolled down his cheeks when he talked of his quarrel with Moritz von Blankenburg." At Friedrichsruh he said to Busch, "I always feel happiest in my top-boots, striding through the heart of the forest, where I hear nothing but the knocking and hammering of the woodpecker, far away from your civilization."

It is also safe to say that no one who seeks the real Bismarck can find him in these volumes alone. Here we have Bismarck in his working dress, with his tobacco and liquor, talking always with his inferiors, the plodding scholar Bucher, the mirror-like Busch. With them he could safely relieve his mind of the acrid temper that heavy responsibility and the dyspepsia had combined to store there, or he could amuse himself by playing Jupiter Olympius amid a group of reverent and acquiescent worshippers. In his own *Memoirs* on the other hand Bismarck is always in full uniform, as Imperial Chancellor, with dignity describing and defending his state-craft. Both these characters belong to the real Bismarck, and without the aid of Dr. Busch the world would scarcely have known the former type, which is far the more interesting. Busch is certainly as silly as Boswell and almost as persistent, and Bismarck displayed an almost sublime sense of security in admitting such a man to intimacy. No other statesman of modern Europe has been so often photographed by the instantaneous process. Perhaps no other statesman has been so confident of his own unique greatness and solitary supremacy that he has become accustomed to think aloud, without reserve, in the presence of his servants. But this suggests again the question, which nine years ago vexed William II.: After 1870 was the German Emperor the man who held the title?

CHARLES H. LEVERMORE.

Gedanken und Erinnerungen von OTTO Fürst von BISMARCK. (New York and Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta. 1898. Pp. xxvi, 647.)

Bismarck, the Man and the Statesman: Being the Reflections and Reminiscences of OTTO Prince von BISMARCK, written and dictated by himself after his retirement from office. Translated from the German under the supervision of A. J. Butler, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1899. Two vols., pp. xxi, 415; xx, 362.)

HAD Julius Caesar left us reminiscences not only of his wars but also of his political activity, and had he interspersed reflections upon the history of the republic since the Gracchi, upon the organization of the new monarchy and upon the policy to be followed in dealing with Rome's allies and enemies, it is needless to inquire what importance historical students would attach to such a book. Of course, there are weak points in this comparison. Bismarck has left behind him results that promise to be permanent, but it is not likely that these will seem as momentous to scholars of the thirty-eighth century as the results of Caesar's life still seem to us. In Caesar's case, moreover, we do not possess what our remote descendants will possess in Bismarck's—letters and speeches covering the man's whole public life and showing his position at every critical moment. But after allowing for all these differences, we may reasonably expect that Macaulay's New Zealander will regard Bismarck's *Reflections and Reminiscences* as material of the highest value for the study of nineteenth-century history.

We, however, naturally regard the book from the angle of to-day, and we ask, as any conscientious journalist would ask: What has Bismarck told us that we did not know before? and then: Has he told us the truth? If we answer the second question in the negative, the first will of course lose most of its interest. Now Lothar Bucher, who wrote at Bismarck's dictation the first draft of these memoirs, told Busch more than once, that the work was going badly. Bismarck, said Bucher, confused his dates and his causal sequences, and—what was worse—he labored under a double bias. He wished to justify himself and was unwilling to admit that he had made any mistakes; and he wished to influence the politics of the day and was using history simply as argument (Busch, II. 541 *et seq.*, 565 *et seq.*). Bucher was a man of great ability and was very familiar with Bismarck's career; but in weighing his criticism, as exclusively reported by Busch, several things are to be remembered. Busch was keenly aware of the commercial value which his diary would possess after Bismarck's death, and he regarded Bismarck's memoirs as a rival work, which might interfere with the sale of his own. Under the influence of this bias, he may have exaggerated Bucher's criticism. When he published this criticism in his book, last year, he had no correction to fear, for Bucher died in 1893. If however we assume that Busch's report is exact, it is still possible that Bucher exaggerated the points of difference between Bismarck and himself. His discussion with Bismarck was of course conducted with a degree of restraint; in talking with Busch, he was able to express himself without restraint; and in the reaction he may well have said more than he really meant. Busch filled his diary with things said in hot blood; and as cold type cannot reproduce the tone, he fills his readers with false impressions. Finally, Bucher indicates (through Busch) that he was struggling to correct Bismarck's bias (and in spite of his discouragement he carried on the struggle to his death), but he does not indicate the result. This we have in the present book, which was repeatedly revised in type before Bismarck's death. In this book there is certainly no such falsification of history as Busch's report of Bucher's utterances might have led us to expect. Bismarck may have confused his dates and sequences, but he and Bucher together seem to have been able to clear up the confusion. Bismarck may have wished to justify himself, and the book shows traces of this natural disposition, but it exhibits no stronger bias than we expect in autobiographies. Bismarck may have valued history as politics teaching by example, but it does not appear that he found it necessary to invent examples. Horst Kohl, a historian with a reputation to guard, has edited the book and has not hesitated to make corrections in foot-notes. Not many such corrections have been found necessary, nor are they of much importance. In his preface, Kohl testifies to Bismarck's "fast untrügliches Gedächtniss."

As to the other question proposed—concerning the increment of information in the book—it may be said broadly that few important facts are here for the first time disclosed. New light is thrown, in some instances, upon well-known events; and throughout the story the personal elements are emphasized. In the scenes from the revolution of 1848 (Chapter II.) Bismarck makes clear what the Liberal historians of the period invariably ignore—that the movement was essentially a town affair. The peasants of his own district, as he satisfied himself before he went to Berlin, were quite ready to fight "die Städter." At court he found the greatest confusion and headlessness. The only man in the royal family, William, had been sent away to hide himself. The King had no idea of resistance; his only scheme was to swim with the current. Augusta foresaw his abdication; imagined that her husband would be forced to waive his rights; and was planning, in accordance with French precedents, to save the throne for her boy, Frederick, with herself as regent under a Liberal ministry. Bismarck tried to stir up the generals to act for the King without his authorization, but found no one of sufficiently high rank who would take the responsibility. That the King could have crushed the revolutionary movement Bismarck does not doubt; and he suggests that the moral authority which Prussia would have acquired, as the only solid Conservative government west of Russia, would have facilitated the extension of her influence in Germany. If this line of policy had been followed with decision while Austria was paralyzed by internal conflicts, Germany might have been unified by dynastic agreements in 1848. The other course open to Prussia—the establishment of German unity with the aid of the German revolutionists—was much less promising; for this plan "overrated the barricades" and underestimated the real strength of the dynasties (cf. Ch. XIII.). If, in either of these ways, Germany had been unified in 1848, the wars with Austria and with France would still have been inevitable: they would merely have come after the establishment of the empire instead of coming before it.

A policy which fluctuated between these courses and adopted neither could lead only to failure. Moreover, the army had been neglected; and the knowledge of its condition, Bismarck tells us, caused him to defend in the Diet those negotiations which led to Olmütz. He tells us elsewhere, however, that the view of the events of 1848–50 which he took at the time was very different from the view which he sets forth in his book. His earlier view was essentially that of his "fraction," which was friendly to Austria. He was still "gut oestreichisch" when he went to Frankfort. The turning-point was reached when at Frankfort he first got sight of Schwarzenberg's despatch of December 7, 1850, with its famous "*avilir, puis démolir.*" If this is not true, it ought to be. It will certainly find its way into the Prussian school histories.

Bismarck attempts no recapitulation of his Frankfort diplomacy: that has been fully set forth in his Frankfort despatches and by Sybel. He gives us pictures of princes and diplomatists, some entertaining anecdotes, and some valuable glimpses of court factions and contending policies at Berlin. Of the same character is his tenth chapter, on his life at St. Petersburg. New, in part, and very interesting is the antecedent history of his entry into the Prussian ministry. Frederick William suggested this more than once; and in 1856 he said: "You have got to be minister." Bismarck, however, did not take this seriously: the King, he believed, was playing him off against Manteuffel in order to bring the latter to terms. Nor did Bismarck desire to be minister under Frederick William, for the King expected from all his ministers absolute obedience. From 1860 on, William repeatedly considered the question of making Bismarck a minister. On this point Bismarck's narrative confirms Sybel's story—a story which Marcks, in his *Kaiser Wilhelm I.*, has treated as a legend. At the same time Bismarck partially confirms what Marcks says of William's disinclination to make the appointment: the King, as Bismarck notes, was decidedly cool to him. Augusta opposed the appointment; and letters from Roon to Bismarck show the importance that was attached to her opposition. During Bismarck's brief stay in France, in 1862, Napoleon III. offered to conclude a formal alliance with Prussia, asserting that he had himself received a similar offer from Austria. The telegram from Roon which summoned Bismarck back to Berlin is given: it read "*Periculum in mora.*"

Before giving us any of his reminiscences as minister, Bismarck interpolates a remarkable survey (Ch. XII.) of Prussian policy from 1790 to 1862, summing it up in the apothegm: "It is frequently less dangerous to do the wrong thing than to do nothing." Light is thrown on Bismarck's policy during the Polish insurrection by a study of the contending factions at the Russian court. Bismarck desired Russian friendship, but not an alliance. In 1863 Russia offered an alliance against Austria; but this, like Napoleon's offer, was declined. Bismarck was never disposed to ally his state with any power which, after victory, might exercise a predominant influence. In noticing the opposition of the Crown Prince throughout the *Confliktzeit*, Bismarck represents himself as having repressed William's desire to deal sternly with Frederick, but the narrative should be read in connection with the documents printed near the end of Busch's second volume. In describing Austria's attempt to increase her ascendancy in Germany through the Congress of Princes (1863), Bismarck points out that the effect of Prussia's abstention was to frighten the smaller states. These were willing to go into any arrangement in which they could play off Austria against Prussia and Prussia against Austria, but they were quite unwilling to deliver themselves into the hands of either power alone. Their refusal to go with Austria gave offense to that power and paved the way for the Austro-Prussian concert and the joint intervention in Schleswig-Holstein. In explaining this phase of Austrian policy, much stress is also laid upon the friendly relations which Bismarck had established with Rechberg at Frankfort. The war with Austria became inevitable when Rechberg was driven from the premiership and this was due not so much to the Schleswig-Holstein question as to Prussia's unwillingness to make any concessions to Austria's desire to enter the Customs Union. These concessions were refused, against Bismarck's judgment, by his colleagues in the Prussian cabinet. In this part of the narrative, and especially in Chapter XVII., there is much to confirm Sybel's contention that Bismarck would have been content with a joint control of Germany by Austria and Prussia, and that it was only the failure of this experiment that compelled Prussia to drive Austria out of Germany. It may be questioned, however, whether both Sybel and Bismarck were not influenced, in describing this phase of Prussian policy, by a desire to strengthen, or at least not to weaken, the present ties between the two empires. Bismarck's utterances, both in letters prior to 1862 and in speeches after 1866, indicate that he never believed in dualism as a permanent arrangement.

In Bismarck's struggle to restrain the King and the military party after Sadowa, and to secure a speedy peace on terms that would leave no implacable resentment smouldering in Austria, Bismarck tells us that he was strongly supported by the Crown Prince—that it was indeed the Crown Prince who persuaded the King to accept Bismarck's advice. In explaining the concessions made to the Liberal party in 1866, Bismarck frankly admits that "universal suffrage" was inserted in his German programme simply as a weapon against Austria. He tells us also that he never believed in the secret ballot, which robs property of its legitimate influence.

Bismarck's account of the genesis of the war with France is disappointing. He adheres to the statement that he did not expect the Spanish candidacy to become a *casus belli*; he makes no mention of the negotiations that were in progress for a French-Austrian-Italian alliance against Prussia; and he defends his action in forcing the war on one ground only—that Prussia, by submitting to the insults she had received from France, would have lost all influence in South Germany.

As regards the internal politics of Prussia and Germany after 1870, the *Reminiscences* offer little that is new, except that Bismarck repudiates personal responsibility for the mistakes of the "Culturkampf" and for the breach with the National Liberal party in 1879. In the former case the blame is laid upon Falk; in the latter it is divided between the National Liberals, who asked too much, and the King, who was unwilling to concede anything. That the National Liberals were at this time intriguing with Augusta's Tories and Ultramontanes to drive Bismarck from power is a statement that we cannot credit. Politics make strange bedfellows, but hardly so strange a fellowship as this.

As regards the European politics of this period, we learn nothing new. The guiding principles of Bismarck's diplomacy are however set forth in a masterly way in Chapters XXIX. and XXX. He asserts that no firm alliance was, or is, open to Germany except with Russia or Austria; and he thinks that the Russian alliance, had it been possible to maintain it, would in many respects have been preferable to the Austrian, because of Russia's greater internal stability. In speaking of Russia's experiences in the Balkan peninsula, he launches a maxim the truth of which we are learning: "Liberated nations are not grateful but exacting."

The greatest contribution, on the whole, that this book makes to our knowledge of German and European history during the latter half of the nineteenth century is to be found in its gallery of historical portraits. Bismarck's power of delineating character has long been appreciated: his Frankfort letters and despatches gave us striking examples. At Frankfort, however, he drew ministers and attachés; in this book he paints royalties and premiers. The picture of William I. is elaborated with especial care and with evident sympathy; but Frederick William IV., Augusta, Frederick, Victoria and Gortschakoff are made equally real. William II. is not included, for the *Reminiscences* close with the death of Frederick. It has been stated, however, in the German press, that Bismarck has left a third volume which may at some future time be published.

The German edition offered in the United States is not made in Germany. It appears that the Harpers, who have the monopoly of the English version, warned the Cottas that the original German version could not be imported. It is to be regretted that this question was not tested in the courts; but the Cottas presumably acted on the advice of counsel in determining to print and publish the German text in New York. They might, however, have given us a better reprint. Their American edition is compressed into one volume, printed on thin paper of the poorest quality and flimsily bound. It is full of misprints, particularly in the French, English and Latin citations.

The English edition is well printed and bound; and it has a fairly good index, which the German-American edition lacks. The translation is, on the whole, good, but it is over-literal: some sentences are made almost unintelligible by a too scrupulous adherence to the wording of the original. "School" and "college" are hardly equivalents for *Gymnasium* and *Universität*, and "Free-thought party" suggests ideas not indicated by the German *freisinnig*. (The position of this group in the German fractional system would have been best indicated by calling it the Radical party.) And why the uncouth adjective "Frederickian?"

MUNROE SMITH.

De Soto and His Men in the Land of Florida. By GRACE KING. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1898. Pp. xiv, 326.)

THE attempt of the author to weave into a continuous story the important parts of the several contemporary narratives of the expedition of De Soto, enlightened with modern criticism, is not without success. It has resulted in presenting the history of the conquest of Florida in the most attractive and readable form in which it has yet appeared in English. It makes it read like a romance—a romance tainted with the rapacity and cruelty of the Spanish conquerors. Nor is the work without scholarship, for a careful comparison of the principal accounts with each other and a consideration of more recent historical criticism of the subject was necessary in order to give the story accuracy, and at the same time to abridge the statements of writers in such a way as not to impair the quality of the work. In this way Miss King has utilized the best of each account in doing justice to adelantado, hidalgos, Spaniards, and Indians, and in representing the facts and true spirit of the expedition.

As the narratives have been abridged and all points in conflict have been omitted it is not necessary to go beyond the author in this brief review to analyze the details of the expedition nor to examine the historical evidence respecting it. The evident object of the writer is to popularize the history of Spanish adventure and discovery, hence the tedious details of historical criticism on controverted or unsettled questions have been studiously and wisely omitted. The author has referred briefly, in the preface, to the important literature on the subject. It is fortunate that there are three reliable contemporary narratives of the De Soto adventure, those of Garcilasso de la Vega, "The Gentleman of Elvas," and Hernandez de Biedma, all of which substantially agree as to the general course of the march, the names of places and the geography of the country. Perhaps there is no other early Spanish exploring expedition so well recorded as this, although there were others more important and better conducted. The questions of the exact route still remain unsettled, although they are determined with sufficient accuracy for the author's purpose. The distance De Soto travelled north after crossing the Mississippi, the course and distance of the journey of Moscoso westward after the death of De Soto, and many other questions of no less importance are still matters of conjecture. The map made by Miss King is too small and too general to admit of critical comparison, but for the indication of the general course of the invaders it serves its purpose as well as the more elaborate map of Delisle or those of his copyists. It has the support of Jones of Georgia and Pickett of Alabama, who have done much to identify the names and places of the Spanish adventure with those of modern times.

The suffering and fortitude of the Spanish explorers are very clearly shown in the story, and in the clear and simple recital of their exploits the poor management of the expedition is everywhere made prominent. Here, as elsewhere, their endurance and bravery came to naught. The thirst for gold, the desire for sudden wealth, so overpowered every other motive as to render futile every effort for successful occupation. Had De Soto been possessed of a rational method and desire to permanently settle the country, he might have been governor of a vast territory which would have brought him wealth and honor, but the Spaniards knew not how to colonize. The cruelty of the Spanish conquerors toward the natives was never made more prominent than in this little story. Without intending to be so it is one of the best descriptions of the habits, customs and character of the natives of the early discovery. The history of no other expedition has brought out these characteristics so well.

Upon the whole the book serves its purpose well, and students and instructors who are seeking familiarity with the early Spanish exploration will read this very readable, well-told story of De Soto with delight.

FRANK W. BLACKMAR.

History of Brulé's Discoveries and Explorations, 1610–1626, being a Narrative of the Discovery by Stephen Brulé of Lakes Huron, Ontario and Superior; and of his Explorations . . . . With a Biographical Notice of the Discoverer and Explorer. By CONSUL WILLSHIRE BUTTERFIELD. (Cleveland: The Helman-Taylor Co. 1898. Pp. xii, 184.)

BRULÉ, born in 1592, came to Canada with Champlain in 1608, and two years afterward was sent to winter among "Hurons who lived near a lake which bears their name" (p. 10). In 1615 he was engaged in Champlain's expedition against the Iroquois Onondaga fort, and was detailed to bring an auxiliary force to the siege. He brought it, but did not arrive till Champlain had abandoned the enterprise. Nothing was heard of him during the next three years, but in 1618 he reappeared among the Hurons who had come for trade at Three Rivers, and told of wanderings down to Chesapeake bay. He was soon employed on a salary of a hundred pistoles as a commercial traveller for persuading the aborigines to bring their furs into French settlements. In 1621 he traded and explored north from the Hurons and afterward westward, possibly reaching Lake Superior. Later, after a journey in the Neutral Nation, he told a missionary "wonders" about them. In 1629 when English invaders lacked a pilot up the St. Lawrence, he was easily bribed to furnish what they needed, becoming on a small scale a Benedict Arnold, and with better success. When Canada became French again, or sooner, he went to live among Hurons, till in 1632 he was killed and eaten by them.

These incidents—matters of common knowledge to readers of Parkman, Winsor, etc.—are the warp and woof of Mr. Butterfield's work. They hardly demand or warrant a two-dollar volume of well-nigh two hundred pages. More than a third of the book, however, consists in notes, which are swelled by something of irrelevant padding. Then criticisms on other writers are multitudinous. Some hole is found, or fancied, in all their coats, "and faith! 'tis printed." Among those thus touched with an Ishmaelitish hand are Parkman as to Brulé's name, etc., Shea as to Daillon, McMullen as to the Mississippi, Garneau as to Récollets, Geddes, Clark and Marshall as to Onondaga, Winsor as to Manitoulin, Neill as to Chesapeake, Slafter as to Three Rivers, Kingsford as to Ontario, Guss as to Capt. John Smith, etc.

The contention of Mr. Butterfield is that he has proved what has always been admitted to be possible, indeed probable, that Brulé was in some sense a four-fold Columbus—first to go down the Susquehanna, and first to discover Lakes Ontario, Huron and Superior, and by a sort of anti-climax, first to shoot Lachine rapids.

Our author's pages are always instructive, though in many of them his hero is conspicuous only by his absence. His geographical details are helpful in identifying localities. His keen exposures of many a minor error will be accepted with thanks by a score of victims humbly kissing the rod. His extracts from rare authors, as Champlain and Sagard, especially those in the original French, will be gratifying to every thorough student.

But Brulé's champion brings forward no new authorities, no newly discovered fact, to thicken the old proofs that did demonstrate thinly. Thus, when Brulé came down from his winter among the Hurons he is stated to "have given Champlain a lengthy account of all he had seen and heard" (p. 20). If he said he had seen Lake Huron, Champlain's journal would have told us so. He does tell us that "four men assured him they had seen that sea" (p. 131). Brulé was not one of them. Huron water was not visible from all parts of the broad Huron land. The Susquehanna story, supported only by Brulé's word, must in Champlain's later years have seemed to him a trifle light as air. His estimate will appear as we proceed. In regard to Lake Superior, Mr. Butterfield makes much of a copper ingot brought by Brulé to Sagard (p. 105). Yet he must know that such floats are still picked up several hundred miles from that lake. He expatiates more largely on a remark of Sagard that "Huron and the large lake beyond it together extended about thirty days' voyage with canoes according to the statement of the savages and of the interpreter four hundred leagues" (p. 161). His words are in French, "trente journées de canots selon le rapport des sauvages *et du truchement quatre cent lieuës de longueur*" (p. 171). These words seem to be used merely as alternative phrases to show the Indian and the French modes of indicating one and the self-same distance.

But our author finds the last clause, in Italics, omitted in Champlain's *Voyages*, edition of 1632. These words were doubtless left out either as unimportant, or because the edition was an abridgment. He however charges the omission to the Jesuits, and moreover finds it big with latent meaning. It proves Brulé's personal inspection of Superior (p. 157). Indeed, he adds (p. 157), "the presumption is strong that Brulé's journey was not ended until he entered the mouth of the St. Louis river at the head of the lake." What a mountain is born from a mole-hill! If Brulé really penetrated to that utmost corner it is a pity that he ever came back to prove a traitor. Champlain's verdict cannot be reversed; Brulé, he says, "was paid a hundred pistoles for inciting the savages to trade. It was an evil custom thus to employ men of such bad lives that they ought to be severely punished. He was known to be very vicious and licentious." His epitaph may well be: Outcast from both English and French, he was deservedly eaten up by savages who, as Mr. Butterfield holds, believed cannibalism the most intense expression of detestation (p. 166).

James D. Butler.

Home Life in Colonial Days. Written by Alice Morse Earle in the year MDCCCXCVIII. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1899. Pp. xvi, 469.)

The reading public is sure to be favorably disposed toward a new work by Mrs. Earle. Her studies of the life and manners, the employments and appliances of the earlier generations on our soil have borne not only abundant, but remarkable fruit. We can recall at least ten books that she has published within this decade, and all of them are closely related to colonial history. Indeed the word colonial seems to have a subtle charm for her, as it has for many others, especially since the Revolutionary centennial observances which brought us all a fresh inspiration.

The new method of writing history, adopted by Green, McMaster, Fiske and others, has taken hold of the popular imagination and aroused a degree of enthusiasm for what may be called the social side of life, never exhibited before. This has favored the organization of patriotic orders and local historical societies with interesting collections of relics, and has created a demand for a more adequate literary interpretation of the real life of the olden time. Mrs. Earle has happily caught this spirit, and with excellent judgment has taken the tide at the flood, and availed herself both of the newly-gathered materials and of the quickened public taste, and with rare industry has associated her name permanently with this engaging field in American history. While she would doubtless consider herself the product of the new period she is to be credited with being one of its chief promoters.

Home Life in Colonial Days is not a repetition of the substance of the author's previous publications, though from the nature of the subject it would seem difficult for her in some cases to avoid it. Her laboratory must be well furnished, or she could not turn out another distinct and comprehensive volume like this. We hardly know whether to commend her more for her zeal in acquiring or her facility in distributing her knowledge. The key to the book is found in the word Home and whatever is associated with it; and as the colonial home was generally a country home we are introduced into an atmosphere which savors of the farm. Whoever has been brought up in a farm-house will relish these vivid descriptions of its old traditional life. The seventeen chapters seem to cover the field exhaustively, and yet we imagine the writer's portfolio may contain supplementary fragments, not treated here, of sufficient consequence to fill another volume.

One advantage of the present book is that while it deals with a single and well-defined subject from beginning to end, each chapter may be read at any time by itself as a separate monograph. Thus the matter of lighting the early homes is traced from pine-knots to candles and oil lamps. This involves a description of each article and of the way in which it was made, including also candlesticks, snuffers and tinder-box. Many readers would turn first to the chapter on The Kitchen Fireside, that centre and source of the old domestic life. Here we have the glow of the log-fire, the crane and pothooks, the great kettles and skillets, the toasters and roasters, not forgetting the warming-pan that hung hard by. Then follows The Serving of Meals, with an account of the board and board-cloth. They had napkins (but no forks for a long time), wooden trenchers, spoons and tankards, pewter plates and porringers, leather mugs, Dutch jugs and cocoanut cups. Among the foods described, Indian corn has a deserved place of honor. Nearly a hundred pages are devoted to the important home industries of spinning and weaving; and the subject is so thoroughly treated that any woman, who wishes to know what it all meant to our grandmothers, will find the mysteries more fully explained here than anywhere else. The account of Hand-weaving is the most complete of any in the book. Girls' Occupations, and Dress of the Colonists, suggest what the feminine reader will be grateful for; and Jack-knife Industries will show that Yankee whittling was done to some purpose. The chapter on Travel and Taverns is not, strictly speaking, as appropriate for this work as for some other which the prolific author might be meditating upon. The same might be said of the fifteenth chapter—Sunday in the Colonies—which would seem to have belonged to the author's well-known *Sabbath in Puritan New England.* However, both of these chapters have a certain connection with the home, and no one need object to the place they occupy here. To write of Colonial Neighborliness in connection with the home was a happy thought, and one that hitherto has not received due attention. "It may seem anomalous to assert that while there was in olden times infinitely greater independence in each household than at present, yet there was also greater interdependence with surrounding households." This proposition is well worked out. The book closes with a charming account of The Old-Time Flower Gardens.

One is surprised to learn how many words which were in common use in former generations are now obsolete with most of us, *e. g.*, huckabuck, noggins, giskin, covercles, twifflers, voider, barbels, guiddonies, pomace, niddy-noddy, thrums, skarne, skilts, weft, mazer and a host of others. Many long-forgotten books also are quoted which elucidate old customs. The Middle and Southern colonies furnish their share of the material of the book, as well as New England. On page 125 an error is noticed in the sentence "not in the waters, but of it," and on page 389 "has gone all traces." In one or two chapters unnecessary expletives appear, *e. g.*, "exceedingly richly;" "early inventories and lists;" "discarded or disregarded;" "usages and customs;" "distinguishing and individual;" "space and locality;" "distinctly and rigidly;" "absorbing and assimilating;" "unexpected and premature."

The author acknowledges her indebtedness to the valuable collections of several of the state historical societies, the Bostonian Society, the Essex Institute, the American Antiquarian Society, the Deerfield Memorial Museum and the Smithsonian Institution. There are about 150 illustrations which shed much light upon the text. Most of them are new; and many of them are of objects of household use which have passed entirely out of sight, and of which the average reader of to-day would hardly know the name. To show how some of the industries were conducted, the writer has taken pains to set up some of the old apparatus in complete working order, and to place women, clad in ancient dress, in the proper attitude of operating it; then she has had these groups photographed. One might fancy that she herself may have posed for the figure shown in Candle-Dipping, or in Flax-Spinning, or in Silk-Braiding, or in Soap-Making.

One pleasure which the historical student has in Mrs. Earle's writings is that they all deal with facts, wholly apart from the creations of fancy. So many writers have attempted to handle the two together that the historical part has been distorted, and often hopelessly confused with the fictitious. The linen cover of the volume is ornamented with a device in the style of a sampler, wrought in the old cross-stitch needle-work—an appropriate symbol of the Colonial Home.

EDWARD G. PORTER.

Historic New York, being the Second Series of the Half-Moon Papers. Edited by MAUD WILDER GOODWIN, ALICE CARRINGTON ROYCE, RUTH PUTNAM and EVA PALMER BROWNELL. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1899. Pp. xii, 470.)

THERE is no lack of system and careful supervision in the publication of The Half-Moon Papers, the second series of which appears under the title *Historic New York*. These monographs, upon topics relating to the history of New York City, were originally intended to meet the demands of students in classes organized by the City History Club. The first series, edited by Maud Wilder Goodwin, Alice Carrington Royce and Ruth Putnam, was the most successful effort ever made to popularize the history of colonial New York. The second series, which has the services of a fourth editorial associate, Eva Palmer Brownell, shows no diminution in any essential excellence. The present volume contains twelve monographs, each with an appropriate bibliography, and there is an index to the whole work which seems to be adequate. In the bibliographies no important omission is noted unless it be the Tory history of New York by Judge Jones.

Edwin Vernon Morgan writes upon "Slavery in New York, with special reference to New York City." It is to be regretted that Mr. Morgan has not enlarged his otherwise excellent essay with a more complete account of the Negro plot of 1712 and of the panic of 1741. The latter event is closely comparable in New York history with the Salem Terror in Massachusetts in 1693. It deserves more space. A concise history of Tammany Hall comes from the skilful hand of Dr. Talcott Williams. The only fault of the sketch is its brevity. Surely, for the purposes of the History Club, the Croker period, virtually omitted here, is the most important of all.

"Old Prisons and Punishments," by Elizabeth Dike Lewis, is a model of its kind; so also is "The Bowling Green," by Spencer Trask. The City Hall Park and the Bowling Green are the two "Commons," which, in New York's history, correspond to the famous "Common" in Boston. In historic action and interest neither of them needs to fear comparison with the sod so sacred to every Bostonian. In City Hall Park stood the liberty pole, chief cause of the battle of Golden Hill.

Here Hamilton spoke. Here still stands the old jail where the patriot McDougall was confined in 1770, and where Provost Cunningham, in 1777, brought his drunken guests after dinner in order that he might "exhibit his prisoners as one would a cage of animals. 'There is that damned rebel, Ethan Allen, sir,' he shouted, 'Allen! get up and walk around.'"

"The New York Press and its Makers in the Eighteenth Century" is the joint contribution of Charlotte M. Martin and Benjamin Ellis Martin. It lacks, first, a few paragraphs of quotation from the articles for which Zenger was arrested, and, secondly, a suitable account of William Livingston's lively *Independent Reflector*. Out of the fulness of his knowledge Berthold Fernow discourses upon "New Amsterdam Family Names and their Origin." Elizabeth Brown Cutting makes a careful, scholarly study of "Old Taverns and Posting Inns," doing full justice, of course, to Fraunces's famous tavern. "The Doctor in Old New York" is the subject assigned to Dr. F. H. Bosworth, who traverses the period from the beginning to the Revolution. The first accredited doctor in the city was John La Montagne, who arrived there in 1637. He was a schoolmaster and a politician as well as a physician, was appointed a member of the governor's council and commanded a garrison of fifty men at the Hope, which was the Dutch fort at Hartford, Conn., not at New London, as Dr. Bosworth seems to think. Emma Van Vechten describes "Early Schools and Schoolmasters of New Amsterdam," the substantial part of her work being the early history of the still existing "School of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch Church of New York." It was founded in 1633 and placed under the care of Adam Roelantsen, who took in washing to eke out his slender stipend. Dr. William R. Shepherd writes acceptably of "The Battle of Harlem Heights," basing the story chiefly upon Professor Henry P. Johnston's admirable monograph. "The Origin of Breuckelen" is explained by Harrington Putnam. The last study in the volume, "The Neutral Ground," by Charles Pryer, presents some picturesque anecdotes of the depredations of Royalist Cowboys and Patriot Skinners in Westchester County, but it is scarcely up to the standard set elsewhere in the volume. References to authorities are inadequate, no map of the region is shown, and there is no mention of the André case, which is the most famous tragedy of The Neutral Ground.

This volume, like its predecessor, is finely illustrated and beautifully printed. In view of its professed purposes it has one serious defect. That is the limitation of each monograph by the attempt to crowd twelve of them into one issue. If the editors would publish but five or six of these excellent studies in a year, they might insure adequate treatment for each topic. Such a subject as Tammany Hall ought to have one volume to itself. The substance of The Inferno cannot be profitably condensed within the fourteen-line limits of a sonnet.

The Provincial Governor in the English Colonies of North America. By EVARTS BOUTELL GREENE, Professor of History in the University of Illinois. [Harvard Historical Studies, Vol. VII.] (New York and London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1898. Pp. x, 292.)

ENCOURAGING signs are beginning to appear that scholars are seriously attempting to work out the history of the American provinces, as distinguished from the history of the New England colonies. The subject is also being approached necessarily and properly from the institutional standpoint. Mr. Greene has made a valuable contribution to the work in his monograph on the Provincial Governor. It is a comparative study of the office of governor as it developed in the proprietary and royal provinces. After an introductory chapter in which he briefly traces the evolution of proprietary and royal government and shows how in their normal forms they were essentially the same, he discusses the evolution of the provincial executive, the governor's appointment, tenure of office and emoluments, his position as an agent of the home government, his relations with the council, his executive powers, his relation to the judiciary, and in three chapters the action and interaction between him and the assembly. Certain typical commissions and instructions are printed at the close of the volume. The material for the work has been drawn almost exclusively from accessible printed sources; no attempt has been made to render it more complete by resort to matter still in manuscript. At the present time and in a subject of this nature, such a course was doubtless wise, for enough of the commissions and instructions and of the colonial laws and records are in print to enable one to draw from them a fairly accurate and satisfactory account of the provincial governor as an official. That Mr. Greene has done. By research among archives he might have made his account of the office more exhaustive, but in its outlines, its main features, it would not have been essentially changed. He has conferred a greater favor upon students by issuing his book thus early, than he would have bestowed by such increased perfection of detail as might have resulted from prolonged investigation. He has shown care and good judgment in the treatment of the material at his command; his attitude is impartial, his conclusions are conservative. The result is that we now for the first time possess a monograph from which one may learn what position was occupied by the chief organ of the provincial executive within the system of which he formed a part.

But the subject is broad. In its treatment much had to be said about the legislature, the judiciary, relations with the home government, the provincial system in general. The council necessarily received much attention. The executive, or even a part of it, could not be treated except in connection with the whole organism. The printed authorities alone afford only a fragmentary view of the provinces. Even these authorities Mr. Greene could not be supposed to have read or digested, so as to have produced from them a rounded and fully proportioned picture of what the provincial governor was in all his forms and relations. Mr. Greene rather has extracted from such sources as were at his command the material which suited his purpose and which could be presented within the limits of his book. If one then should say that the treatment is somewhat incomplete, or even fragmentary, if one might think that in many instances other illustrations could be selected which would prove the points that he wished to make quite as well as, or in some cases even better than those he has chosen, the critic would not thereby reflect at all upon Mr. Greene's diligence or cast any doubt upon his success, but would simply suggest that the subject is too broad to be fully treated within the limits set and too new to be adequately treated as yet by any one. For a considerable time to come, in all matters relating to the colonial period of our history, we must be content with results which are relatively satisfactory and complete. Much more work, I take it, must be done, in social as well as political history, the conditions actually existing in the different provinces must be understood and distinguished much more clearly, we must know better than we now do how much effectiveness there was in the support given by the home government to the governors, before we can fully estimate their position. And how can any of these results be attained until the documentary and other sources of our early history are made much more accessible in print, and until they have been more scientifically studied than has been common until recent years?

Mr. Greene, in speaking of tenure of office, might profitably have referred to the fact that royal governors were frequently transferred from one province to another and have taken this into account in estimating the permanence of tenure. Andros and Nicholson are notable instances in point. He seems uncertain as to the time when the treasurer was added to the officials of New York. This was done in the fall of 1706, as is shown by the governor's speech at the opening of the September session of that year, and by the *Laws*, Chap. 159. On pp. 145 and 155 he speaks of the Massachusetts charter of 1691 and the Pennsylvania "charter" of 1701 as if they were documents of the same character and class. He would have found in the history of the Third Intercolonial War better and more numerous instances of the designation by the assembly in New York of commissioners to control military affairs, and of the confusion occasioned thereby, than he has given. On p. 138 he refers to Chalmers as authority for the statement that the erection of a court of exchequer by Gov. Nicholson of South Carolina was illegal, but Chalmers is speaking in that passage concerning Gov. Johnston of North Carolina. Mr. Greene's manner of referring to the volumes of the *Maryland Archives* is confusing rather than helpful. I may conclude this criticism of a book for which substantial praise is due by suggesting that the addition of a chapter on the relation of the governor to the land system, and of another on the ecclesiastical side of his activity, would have made it more complete and valuable.

HERBERT L. OSGOOD.

Philadelphia; The Place and The People. By AGNES REPPLIER. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1899. Pp. xv, 392.)

EXPLAINING in a literary journal why she wrote this volume, Miss Repplier said, with a candor equalling her brevity, "because the publishers gave me the work to do." No doubt the mandate of a publisher is something like the invitation of the Queen, and yet we must hesitate to affirm that it is the most adequate and satisfactory *raison d'être* for historical work. For if the Muse of History be not so jealous a mistress as she of the Law is proverbially alleged to be, she still is not without her exacting views as to the nature of a preparation for service in her train.

This book is not, however, in the strict sense a history, and the title-page, it will be observed, does not so designate it. Miss Repplier, whose success as an essayist is well known, has made for us an extended essay—not a study—upon the experiences and qualities of those people who lived, or who persist in living, on the site selected by Penn's Commissioners in 1681 for his city on the Delaware. Her purpose, well fulfilled, is to make a readable volume, and she has applied a light and graceful touch—sometimes disclosing the firmness beneath—to her work. Her vein of humor, with a dash of satire, "carries off" episodes and situations over which a more laborious writer might easily tire us. Her introductory chapter is itself an essay—something like the sketch in miniature which the etcher places at the bottom of his picture—and discusses the general character of Philadelphia. "Every community," Miss Repplier says, "like every man, carries to old age the traditions of its childhood, the inheritance derived from those who bade it live. And Philadelphia . . . still bears in her tranquil streets the impress of the Founder's touch. Simplicity, dignity, reserve, characterize her now, as in Colonial days. . . . To those who by right of heritage call themselves her sons, and even such step-children as are, by nature or grace, attuned to the chill tranquillity of their foster-mother, Philadelphia has a subtle charm that endures. . . . In the restful atmosphere of her sincere indifference, men and women gain clearness of perspective, and the saving grace of modesty. . . More impetuous towns speed like meteors on their paths . . . but the Quaker City sees them rush by without envy, without ambition, without distaste, without emotions of any kind."

The chronological order of events is observed, but not closely followed, and as certain themes are presented, the "birth of Learning," the formation of the Philosophical Society, the founding and growth of the College and University, the establishment of the Hospital, the trials and tribulations of the drama, the rise of the dancing assemblies, in general the social conditions at different periods—these are treated topically, and carried beyond the immediate time of the narrative. It is in these that we find Miss Repplier—as indeed we should expect—to please us best; her art of dealing with phases of life and aspects of society is always past denial. The book may thus be said to refer to cults and conditions more than to persons and events. Indeed there are relatively few persons who appear, and if there were an index—as unhappily there is not—it would present but a thin list of individualized figures. Franklin's name occurs often, and he receives the high consideration that can never be denied him, while William Penn is always kindly and respectfully treated. The book is dedicated to his memory, and in the introduction it is said that while Philadelphia owes a debt of gratitude to the many hands that have labored in its behalf, "deepest of all is her debt to Penn, who knew her little, but who loved her well"—an antithesis which in its primary member might perhaps be challenged, for Penn no doubt knew Philadelphia very well, as long as he had the mind left to know much of anything.

To hunt for errors of statement in so debonair a volume would be ungracious, if not indecent. A wicked misprint (p. 3) makes Thomas Fox out of Thomas Loe, the preacher who converted William Penn to Quakerism. Alexander Graydon, he of the *Memoirs*, is called "Dr." Graydon repeatedly, though he was innocent of such a degree, in medicine, divinity or otherwise. Hannah Penn is said (p. 57) to have had three sons; she had a fourth likewise, Dennis, who nearly reached manhood. We are told (p. 57) that "his scapegrace son William" accompanied the Founder on his second visit to Pennsylvania, in 1699, and that when the latter returned, 1701, he "was left in the colony," both these statements being in error. Young William came over—with that cranky youth Governor Evans—in 1704, and returned to England the same year. It is said (p. 65) that the proprietary rights in Pennsylvania passed on Penn's death "to his widow, for the worthless son did not long survive his father," this being wrong in one particular and misleading in another; William did not inherit the proprietary rights, nor did the widow—they went to her sons, who after Dennis's death were three, John, Thomas, and Richard. It is said (p. 54) that after the Revolution "of 1689" in England, Penn "was promptly deprived of his proprietary rights." As the appointment of Col. Fletcher (by which Penn was deprived of his power of government), occurred in October, 1692, nearly four years after William put James out of England, this can hardly be called "promptly," and a similar remark, though reversed in form, might be made concerning the statement that "after years of trouble and disrepute" the government was restored to Penn; really the suspension of his authority lasted some twenty-two months.

There are some good illustrations in the book, by E. C. Peixoto, and some that are so exceedingly "sketchy" as to be of no service in such a work. A fine example of the latter is "A Site for a Fair City," which appears to be an "impressionist" view of a spring freshet on some inland creek. The legends under the illustrations are in several cases quite inappropriate.

Howard M. Jenkins.

A History of the Baptists of the Middle States. By HENRY C. VEDDER, Professor of Church History in Crozer Theological Seminary. (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1898. Pp. v, 349.)

THIS volume has many excellencies. It contains eleven chapters together with half-a-dozen appendixes. The subjects of the chapters are as follows: Early Days in New York; Early Days in New Jersey; Early Days in Pennsylvania and Delaware; Growth of Organization; The Western Movement, its Result and Significance; Evangelism and Revivals; The Period of Controversies; Baptists and Education; Work for the Young—The Publication Society; Baptists and Bible Work; A Comparative Study of Progress. Several of the appendixes set forth the results of interesting and profitable studies in statistics.

The American Baptist Publication Society is making advances in various directions. The above is the second of a series of five volumes which are intended to describe the history of Baptists in every section of the United States. As the Baptists of the Middle States beyond question have shaped the development and doctrine of Baptists throughout the country, one could wish that Professor Vedder's volume had been given the first place in the series.

It is rare to find a book of so much insight and that so abounds in wise and suggestive thoughts. It concedes that Arminian Baptists had the ascendancy in America until the year 1742, at which time Philadelphia Association adopted a Calvinistic Confession of Faith and threw herself heart and soul into the religious movement of the eighteenth century. At that time it gained the hegemony of American Baptists. It has held this hegemony ever since. Its influence has been paramount. To be sure Southern Baptists, since the separation that took place in 1845, have been in large measure shut away from the development of Baptist life and thought in other portions of the country. That isolation has resulted in a good many instances in a type of doctrine and practice hitherto unknown among Baptists. But the isolation of Southern Baptists is not at present so pronounced as in former years, and there is reason to hope for better things, and for a return in due season to the views advocated by Baptists in other portions of the world. That process might have been promoted if Professor Vedder could have supplied a chapter on the history of Baptist doctrine in the Middle States.

The enlightened action of Philadelphia Association in connection with the Great Awakening is clearly set forth. She entered heartily into the revival, and her courage and conduct in connection with it are the crown and marvel of Baptist annals. First, she put her own house in order, a work that was accomplished as early as 1742. Then she laid hold upon the General Baptists in South Carolina, and in 1751 organized Charleston Association to keep the territory she had gained there. Next she captured the flourishing General Baptist interest in North Carolina, and in 1758 Kehuke Association was set up in the place of it. Afterwards she captured the General Baptists in Northern Virginia and founded Ketocton Association to hold forth the word of life as she understood it. As early as 1764 she began to wrestle with the Baptists of New England, and established Rhode Island College as an outpost. In 1767 Warren Association was organized with particular reference to the large and influential Separate Baptist interest, and not without reference also to the General Baptists, who had held the ground before the arrival of the Separates. By this means she shortly captured Isaac Backus, and with him ultimately nearly all the Separate Baptists of New England. The Separate Baptists of the South had grown too strong to be entirely swallowed up, but in 1787 she quietly effected a union with them in Virginia, which practically gave her control of all the Separate Baptists of the Southern and Western states. These were masterly strokes indeed. In the short period of forty-five years Philadelphia Association had brought the Baptists of the whole country to submit to her leadership. The Church of Rome can hardly exhibit a like record of vigorous and splendid achievement. And the right hand of Philadelphia has not yet forgot her cunning.

Professor Vedder renders it still more apparent than it had been before that the coming of Luther Rice was the most important event in Baptist history of the nineteenth century. We have never been able hitherto to estimate correctly the proportions of this extraordinary person. He was the magician of American Baptist life. Mr. Rice moved his wand and almost in an instant the scattered Baptist churches of the United States were changed into a Baptist Denomination. At his instigation the General Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States for Foreign Missions was organized in 1814, when possibly for the first time the title "Denomination" was officially applied to our people. Nothing is so great as a great man. Mr. Rice introduced the enterprise of foreign missions among American Baptists. Mr. Rice also introduced the enterprise of domestic missions among American Baptists. Mr. Rice established Columbian College and gave an impulse to Baptist education in all sections of the country. Mr. Rice was closely connected with the origin of the Publication Society. Likewise was he connected with the *Columbian Star*, and so imparted a momentum to the Baptist press which it has never lost. As a result of his activity state conventions sprang up in many quarters to promote the cause of missions, and in a few years the constitution of the Baptist denomination was changed in a marvellous fashion. Finally, Mr. Rice became the occasion of a wide-spread schism between Baptists of the "Old School" and Missionary Baptists.

It was fitting that a spirit so great and fruitful should experience contradictions. Mr. Rice had his limitations. These brought him countless sorrows, but he bore them all with the humility of a saint and the patience of a hero. Professor Vedder shows that Rice was in no sense a business man and did not understand the science of book-keeping. He was accused of mismanagement and even of peculation. By the year 1826 the General Convention had become financially embarrassed.

Those limitations and this embarrassment produced in their turn some beneficial changes in the constitution of the Baptist denomination. A tendency towards centralization had been developing very strongly in the General Convention. In 1817 the body had taken up the work of home missions in addition to foreign missions, and later it had assumed the burdens and management of Columbian College. When the crash befell in 1826, this tendency to centralization was checked and crushed. The General Convention washed its hands of the cause of home missions and also of the cause of education. Columbian College was set adrift to provide for itself, and the work of home missions was discontinued until the year 1832 when a separate and independent society was organized to care for it. The Publication Society was likewise able to maintain a separate and independent existence, and in 1888 the Americn Baptist Education Society, another separate and independent institution, was established to provide for the interests of Baptist learning. The failures of Luther Rice left as broad and beneficent a mark upon the constitution and history of the Baptist denomination as his successes. American Baptists have never yet done justice to the colossal figure of that extraordinary man.

The second Church of Swansea, Mass., referred to by Professor Vedder in a footnote on page 54, is the body mentioned by Benedict, *History of the Baptists*, Boston, 1813, I. 427, and not the body mentioned by Backus, I. 450.

WM. H. WHITSITT.

The Making of Methodism: Studies in the Genesis of Institutions. By JOHN J. TIGERT, D.D., LL.D., Editor of the *Methodist Review.* (Nashville: Barbee and Smith. 1898. Pp. xiv, 175.)

DR. TIGERT is well known to students of American church history as the author of a very able *Constitutional History of American Episcopal Methodism.* The present work treats the same themes topically instead of chronologically. It comprises in all thirteen chapters. Two of these trace the origin and development of the peculiar Episcopacy of American Methodism, two are devoted to the equally peculiar Presiding Eldership, three relate to the Itinerancy, five to the Genesis of the Annual and General Conferences, and one to the Baltimore Conference System of Government. The title of the book is, therefore, misleading. It treats not of the making of Methodism; but of Methodist ecclesiastical machinery. In the author's phrase, "it is a contribution to the correct construction of our governmental history."

This history is unfortunately crowded with controversy, the dust of which is evident enough in every treatment of it. Dr. Tigert has very definite views of "correct construction;" and these have colored or rather embroidered his account of bishops, presiding elders and ministers. We wish he had permitted the facts to speak for themselves. The value of the work, however, is in the chapters on the conferences and the splendid criticism of the sources of their history. The author has examined these with great industry and candor, and this reviewer is pleased to verify some very important conclusions. Ezekiel Cooper's printed copy of the minutes of 1785 lies before him. Dr. Tigert did not know of its existence. It is, therefore, a striking proof of his critical sagacity that, as he infers, it *does not contain the prefatory note of the reprinted minutes of 1795* and that the title-page corresponds exactly to Jesse Lee's description of it, viz.: *Minutes of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America.*

Competent judges will dispute none of Dr. Tigert's seven points touching the Christmas Conference; neither will they demur to his conclusion that the General Conference of 1792 was the creature of the yearly assemblies which created the ill-starred council. But the disquisition that follows abounds in needless refinements. The Christmas Conference that constituted the Methodist Episcopal Church in America did not, of course, abolish "the conference." It was itself "the conference" in extraordinary session. It governed subsequent conferences, so far as its work was allowed to stand, and its chief work has stood until this day. The creation of the ill-starred council interrupted the orderly development of "the conference" and might have disrupted the church. The General Conference of 1792 was a return to the fundamental principle implied in the action of 1784, the ultimate sovereignty of the itinerant ministry. And its provision for stated conferences of all the preachers was to prevent any such devices as the Baltimore System or the disrupted council. This, however, did not necessarily destroy the supremacy of the annual conferences. It made it unnecessary to assert it. Dr. Tigert himself points out that up to 1808 "the annual conferences assumed to be fully competent to remodel the superintendency at will." The General Conferences from 1792 to 1808 were convenient instruments only; servants and not masters of the annual conferences. Directly they attempted to be the masters, disruption was threatened; the Delegated General Conference created in 1808 averted the disaster.

All that Dr. Tigert writes about the Baltimore Conference system and the period between 1784 and 1792 is interesting and instructive. But his statement "that government by the conferences passed away forever in 1792" is rather sweeping. On the contrary, Bishop McKendree revived it in his famous appeal to the annual conferences against the action of 1820; he won his notable victory by a return to the early practice. And when assailed for it he defended himself with Asbury's example. And, if this reviewer is not in error, Dr. Tigert in his *Constitutional History* has maintained the validity of such an appeal.

Dr. Tigert never perverts and never suppresses a fact. He is wholly free from the tricks of controversialists. Nevertheless his prepossessions unconsciously determine his phrases, so that inference and narrative are blended sometimes inharmoniously. One of these prepossessions is the independence of the bishops from the authority of the General Conference. This gives a peculiar twist to his statements about them. Note the following, especially the metaphors:

"At this period (1807) little connected with the superintendency was regarded as organized, established, or permanent. Precipitation and crystallization occurred in 1808. At this time the constitution was established. It excepted episcopacy and the plan of General Superintendency from statutory modification by the General Conference." How deftly the clause "it excepted episcopacy" is introduced! Just as subtle is the other phrase "statutory modification." Now all that the constitution of 1808 determined was this: Diocesan episcopacy should never be adopted by the General Conference alone. The episcopacy has been modified. But Dr. Tigert calls this "development," and tells us frankly all about it. He tells us that Asbury maintained the right of the senior bishop to make all the appointments; that McKendree yielded to him the preliminary draft; that Asbury refused to consult the presiding elders; that McKendree refused to make appointments without them; that McKendree doubted the constitutionality of the present "necessary" system; that Bishop Soule's scruples were silenced at last only by the principle that necessity knows no law. He tells us moreover that the General Conference of 1824 passed a resolution allowing the bishops a choice between "episcopal departments" and "travelling in a circuit after each other." "The bishops," he adds, "took different views *of this action of the General Conference.*" A conflict between McKendree and George nearly ended in a rupture of the episcopacy and the church. So that "in 1832 *the General Conference sought again to give relief* and passed a resolution that they deemed it inexpedient to require each Bishop to travel throughout the church during the recess of the General Conference." To call this "development" rather than modification is an ostrich-like attempt to escape the facts. It were wiser to follow Ranke's rule and to tell just how things happened.

Nevertheless, this is a noteworthy and invaluable book. No student of American church history can afford to neglect it; and every student of Methodist history will find it indispensable. It is replete with information, accessible hitherto to very few, and is marked throughout with rare insight and logical ability.

Charles J. Little.

The Underground Railroad from Slavery to Freedom. By Wilbur H. Siebert, Associate Professor of European History in Ohio State University. With an Introduction by Albert Bushnell Hart, Professor of History in Harvard University. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1898. Pp. xxv, 478.)

No one before Professor Siebert has undertaken to make a survey of the whole field of operations of the philanthropists, Southern as well as Northern, who made organized efforts to guide and shelter fugitives from slavery. These efforts were necessarily secret, and it was unsafe to keep records. Fugitives were passed on from one station to another, over lines crossing the Canadian frontier at myriad points, from Michigan to Maine. Professor Siebert's work has been to piece together a multitude of independent facts, obtained at the cost of immense labor. It is well he began his task while many are living who were active agents of the Underground Railroad. In a few years not one of these will be left to tell his story. As to the total number of escapes it is difficult to make exact estimates. The professor shows that the census reports are entirely unreliable. For instance, the official tables enumerate only 1011 slaves who escaped in 1850. And yet a record kept by Robert Purvis, of Philadelphia, shows that an average of about one thousand per year, from 1830 to 1860, passed through the hands of the Vigilance Committee of that city alone, while agents in Ohio, in the same period, aided more than one thousand per year on an average, and there was no decrease in activity while the last and most stringent law was on its passage. Southern statesmen in Congress, while urging the passage of the law of 1850, are quoted by Professor Siebert (p. 341) as making these estimates:

> "In August, 1850, Atchison, of Kentucky, informed the Senate that 'depredations to the amount of hundreds of thousands of dollars are committed upon the property of the people of the border slave states of this Union annually.' Pratt, of Maryland, said that not less $80,000 worth of slaves was lost every year by citizens of his state. Mason, of Virginia, declared that the losses of his state were already too heavy to be borne, that they were increasing from year to year, and were then in excess of $100,000 per year. Butler, of South Carolina, reckoned the annual loss of the Southern section at $200,000. Clingman, of North Carolina, said that the thirty thousand fugitives then reported to be living in the North were worth at current prices little less than $15,000,000."

Whether or not these estimates are reliable (and our author does not commit himself to either of them), it is certain that the operations of the Underground Railroad were of sufficient importance to keep both sections of the country in constantly increasing agitation, for a period of more than thirty years. The first impulse of law-loving communities at the North was to respect the guarantees of the Constitution. The number of those who openly declared they would obey the "higher law" was not large; and yet when a slave hunt was in progress on this side of the border, the sympathy of whole communities was enlisted for the fugitives. The operation of the drastic law of 1850 was rapidly doing the work which the superb oratory of Garrison, Phillips, and Douglass, and the burning verse of Whittier, had been only slowly accomplishing. This attempt to nationalize the institution of slavery, and make the whole North a hunting-ground for slave-drivers, was one of the principal causes of the overturn in politics which resulted in the election of Abraham Lincoln. Professor Siebert does not overrate the importance of the Underground Railroad, when he says it was "one of the greatest forces which brought on the civil war, and thus destroyed slavery."

A conspicuous merit of this work is its author's careful reference to the sources of information he has consulted. The authorities for all statements of fact are given in abundant footnotes. He does not yield to the temptation to give in detail romantic incidents of the notable dashes for freedom which he chronicles, but in every case tells where the full story may be found. He names not only the leaders and heroes of the movement, but humbler devotees to the cause of liberty, to the number of several thousands. In an appendix he gives thirty-five pages of closely printed names of Underground Railroad operators, arranged alphabetically by states and counties, and this is but one of many examples of his thoroughness which might be given. He has not failed to treat with the utmost charity the slaveholders who pursued their fleeing property, and the Northern men who felt it to be their disagreeable duty to abide by the guarantees of the Constitution, and aided in the capture of fugitives. He brings no railing accusation against any, although his sympathy with the hunted bondmen and their helpers is apparent on every page.

In his first chapter Professor Siebert refers to the difficulties encountered in his search for facts, the scarcity of contemporaneous documents, and the value of reminiscences from a great variety of sources intelligently pieced together. He then recites the early provisions for the return of fugitive slaves in the original Constitution, in the Ordinance of 1787, and in the first fugitive slave law of 1793. He next calls attention to the first systematic efforts to provide fugitives with the means of escape, in spite of the law. The secret lines leading to freedom were organized in eastern Pennsylvania, before railroads were known, and they were first called the Underground Road by a puzzled slave-master, who, after searching all other roads in vain, said "his nigger must have gone off on an underground road." The law of 1793, with its summary method of disposing of cases involving the question of human liberty, was freely denounced at the North, and its penalty of $500 did not prevent its frequent violation. The doubly stringent fugitive slave law of 1850, with its fine of $1000 and imprisonment, and its acceptance of the word of the slave-hunter, while the alleged slave was given no voice, afforded opportunities for kidnapping free colored people. In many instances, persons who were never before in a slave state, were carried over the border on the pretence that they were fugitives, and they were in good luck if they had some powerful white friends to interfere in their behalf. The chances were they would be hurried to the Gulf States and lose their freedom irreclaimably.

Professor Siebert devotes an interesting chapter to the life of colored refugees in Canada. The good will and justice there received offset in some measure their suffering from the rigors of the climate. In another chapter the curious fact is brought out that some of the most active helpers of runaways were Southerners by birth and education. Indeed, the reputed president of the Road, who personally aided more than three thousand slaves in their flight, was Levi Coffin, of North Carolina, whose cousins Vestal and Addison Coffin were also active in the same work. These Coffins, by the way, were descendants of Tristram Coffin, the founder of Nantucket, a branch of whose family went South early in the last century. They were, therefore, kinsmen of Joshua Coffin of Newburyport, one of the original thirteen of Garrison's disciples, who repeatedly risked his life in helping back to freedom colored men who had been kidnapped at the North and taken to the extreme South. Whittier has drawn his portrait in his poem, "To My Old Schoolmaster."

One of the features of the underground service commented upon by our author was its effect as a safety-valve to the institution of slavery. If some of the abler men like Douglass had found no other means of escape, they might have organized formidable insurrections. Many slaves were the sons of masters, and it would be strange if they did not inherit some instincts that might prove dangerous to the institution which degraded them. Some masters were found who had not the heart to enslave their own children, and who sent them to the best schools in Canada. It is not generally known, but it is true, that two of the ablest and best beloved priests in the Roman Catholic Church in this country are sons of a master who thus provided for them and who gave freedom to their mother. One of these sons, who might have been a slave, is now a bishop. He is a cousin of the escaped slave, Ellen Craft, their mothers being sisters, and like her he has only slight trace of his negro origin. The writer of this review had the story from Ellen Craft herself, who called upon her cousin when she last visited this country.

Professor Hart, of Harvard University, contributes an introduction to this valuable work, in which he calls attention to the points upon which Professor Siebert's immense labor throws new light.

Samuel T. Pickard.

The True History of the Missouri Compromise and its Repeal. By Mrs. Archibald Dixon. (Cincinnati: The Robert Clarke Company. 1899. Pp. xii, 623.)

Mrs. Dixon is not pleased with the historians who have written of the Missouri Compromise and its Repeal. In her judgment none of them have treated these important measures adequately and most of them have added misrepresentation to their other shortcomings. She has undertaken, therefore, in the interest of truth and justice, to set forth "a clear statement" of the facts. While Mr. Dixon, naturally, figures rather prominently in the book, the great burden of it proves to be the cupidity and aggression of the North. We are told that these unfortunate traits became prominent as early as the date of the Federal Convention; that three of the New England states, striking a bargain with South Carolina and Georgia, fastened the slave-trade upon the country for twenty years and that our subsequent national calamities were largely the fruit of this base triumph of greed over principle.

The debates of the convention on the slave-trade may not be altogether pleasant reading, but Mrs. Dixon does the Northern representatives scant justice. Some of them believed with Oliver Ellsworth that "slavery in time will not be a speck in our country," and this conviction served to gloss and disguise "the compromitting;" others felt that

Congress, in ultimately securing control of the traffic, which it did not possess under the old confederation, gained a great point. Besides, Roger Sherman voiced the general sentiment when he said that it was "better to let the Southern states import slaves than to part company with them." As the choice seemed to be between twenty years of slave-trade and anarchy they chose the former. Madison approved of this choice at least after it was made. "Great as the evil is," he said in the convention of Virginia on the adoption of the Federal Constitution, "a dismemberment of the Union would be worse."

Mrs. Dixon contends that the defeat of Charles Pinckney's motion to postpone the report of the committee on the slave-trade and take up the navigation act fastened this traffic upon the unwilling South, because the North would never have agreed to the report if a two-thirds vote should be necessary to pass a navigation act. Suppose "the compliance" with certain Southern states had failed, what then? "Do we remedy the evil?" asked Iredell in the convention of North Carolina. "No, sir, we do not. For if the Constitution be not adopted, it will be in the power of every state to continue it forever." He considered the concession agreed upon, such was the attitude of South Carolina and Georgia, "the utmost that could be obtained."

It does not to seem to have occurred to Mrs. Dixon that the opposition of Virginia to the continuance of the slave-trade might have been inspired quite as much by commercial as by ethical considerations. She owned more than half of the 520,000 slaves estimated to have been in the South when the Constitution was adopted. Fresh importations tended to lessen their value. At all events it is suggestive that George Mason should denounce the slave-trade, in the Virginia convention, as so inhuman that he could not express his detestation of it, and yet should complain, as if the victim of some great injustice, "they have not secured us the property of the slaves we have already!" According to Charles Cotesworth Pinckney "the opinion" of Virginia in the Federal convention was "interested and inconsistent." The North, according to Mrs. Dixon, appeared to no better advantage in the Federal Congress of 1819–1821 than in the Federal Convention of 1787. She describes the Missouri Compromise as "an unjust, arbitrary and unconstitutional exercise of power on the part of Congress." It was a surrender rather than a compromise. That the territories belonged to the whole country; that citizens of every section had a right to migrate thither and take with them their property whether the inventory happened to include slaves or not, seems as indisputable to our author as the axioms of mathematics. Fear of losing control of the House of Representatives, she says, and the fact that if Southern institutions got a footing in Missouri Northern laborers would be excluded, led to a plot to prevent the admission of this territory except as a free state. The South felt exclusion to be "an infinite wrong" and accepted a geographical compromise as the only alternative to disunion.

Is all this "A True History?" Mrs. Dixon does not like Benton and may not regard his declaration, that the compromise, so far from being a Northern measure, was "imposed . . . by the South upon the North," as a matter of particular importance, but she ought to be interested in a letter of Charles Pinckney, dated "Congress Hall, March 2, 1820, 3 o'clock at night," and addressed to the editor of a Charleston newspaper. The bill, he wrote, "is considered here by the slave-holding states as a great triumph," since the territory free of the restriction will give the South six and perhaps eight senators. Then, if the first compromise was imposed upon the South, how did it happen that the North should have repudiated the compact in less than a year after it received the signature of President Monroe? The fact is that the objections raised against the constitution of Missouri were merely a convenient mask for a fresh attack upon the geographical settlement.

The South did not think that the Missouri question would produce a dissolution of the Union, at least Calhoun, whose views were likely to be as gloomy as those of any man in Washington, did not. One does not find in the Congressional debates much evidence of serious apprehension on the part of the Southern Congressmen. Northern Representatives, it is true, indulged in some inflammatory talk. Tallmadge would not forbear to contribute his "mite of blood" if it should be necessary to quench any conflagration he had helped to kindle, and Otis of Massachusetts, rather than admit Missouri with slavery, could wish the Mississippi had been "an eternal torrent of burning lava, impassable as the lake which separates the evil and the good." This sort of declaration did not disturb the Southern Representatives very much. They were able to take care of themselves both in the matter of rhetoric and of argument. John Quincy Adams pronounced them superior to the Northern Representatives. Indeed they succeeded in driving the latter from their original position that Congress has the right to impose conditions upon new commonwealths, which the Constitution did not impose upon the original commonwealths, but failed to dislodge them from their second position that the Constitution confers upon Congress general powers of legislation in the territories. This doctrine constituted the basis of the compromise and is sound from the standpoint of constitutional law.

Mrs. Dixon devotes a large amount of space to the repeal of the Missouri restriction—a measure which her husband proposed as an amendment to Douglas's bill to organize the territory of Nebraska. She effectually disposes of the story, which has gained some currency, that Seward "put Archy Dixon . . . up to moving the repeal." The Kentucky senator needed no suggestion of that sort. While the Douglas bill adopted the non-intervention principles of the Compromise of 1850, he saw that it did not repeal the Missouri Compromise. Believing in direct methods and consulting nobody he gave notice in the Senate, January 16, 1854, of his intention to force a repeal of this so-called compact. Dixon's motives were wholly sincere and patriotic. He contended that the restrictive legislation was unconstitutional and that popular sovereignty or home-rule was a principle of universal application, the adoption of which in the territories would compose all sectional strife. Douglas finally "engrafted" the amendment upon his Nebraska bill. Doubtless he preferred the original indefiniteness of the measure, since it appears to have been chiefly a move in the game of presidential politics.

But the Nebraska bill with or without amendment was a monumental blunder and nothing that Mrs. Dixon has written makes it seem otherwise—unless war and the destruction of slavery by force of arms were to be desired. Apparently it never occurred to Senator Dixon or to the author of *The True History*, that if Congress had the right to acquire territory, it must also have the right to govern it. The South should have left no stone unturned to perpetuate the era of good feeling which followed upon the Compromise of 1850. It should have avoided all irritating and sectional issues, strengthened its system of domestic policy, and pocketed philosophically the occasional loss of a runaway slave. But other counsels prevailed; the Missouri Compromise was repealed—a result which the Compromise of 1850 did not effect—and the firebrand of popular sovereignty flung into the territories. The consequences of a measure, which was vague in all essential matters, which neither indicated the time when the will of the people should be ascertained nor provided machinery to determine it, could be nothing less than confusion, lawlessness and finally bloodshed.

Mrs. Dixon carries the practice of allowing men to tell their own story to excess. Chapter XX., for example, which contains seventy-three pages, is mainly a report of debates from the *Congressional Globe*. And on the whole her book, though dedicated to the truth of history, may be fairly characterized as an impassioned defense of mistaken policies and untenable constitutional theories.

LEVERETT W. SPRING.

History and Digest of the International Arbitrations to which the United States has been a Party, together with Appendices containing the Treaties, relating to such Arbitrations, and Historical and Legal Notes on other International Arbitrations ancient and modern, and on the Domestic Commissions of the United States for the Adjustment of International Claims. By JOHN BASSETT MOORE, Hamilton Fish Professor of International Law and Diplomacy, Columbia University, New York; sometime Assistant Secretary of State of the United States. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1898. Six vols., pp. 5079.)

FIVE years ago Professor Moore began his labors, now happily and honorably ended, upon the history of the international arbitrations to which our government has been a party. This work has been done under a virtual Congressional contract, designating him as the editor, the consideration of which was the beggarly sum of twenty-five hundred dollars, the greater part of which has necessarily been expended by the author in fees to copyists. The joint resolution required a digest of the decisions rendered in these arbitrations to accompany the history, and Professor Moore has taken pains to make this particularly full, adding references to all the authorities cited in the arguments of agents and opinions of commissioners and umpires. Not only does he touch upon the various points in dispute in each arbitration proceeding as it is treated, but separate chapters are devoted to such subjects as Rules of Procedure, Powers of Arbitrators to Determine their own Jurisdiction, Intervention, Domicil, Nationality, Renunciation of the Right to National Protection, Neutrality, Arrest, Imprisonment and Detention, Expulsion, Acts of Authorities, Denial of Justice, and Limitation and Prescription. With the same fulness he gives accounts of classes of cases that come before mixed commissions—contract claims, revenue cases, forced loans, bond cases, war claims and prize cases. He has thus let loose upon the world, to borrow Professor Woodrow Wilson's phrase, an immense amount of "cloistered learning," and has thereby rendered an invaluable service to our government, and indeed to all civilized governments disposed to settle international disputes by peaceful means. The publicist, the diplomat, and the historian will find in Professor Moore's volumes a rich mine of information. It would have been very easy for the author under his contract to have given a dry and perfunctory statement of the formation, proceedings and adjudications of these arbitral boards. But Professor Moore, who had as early as 1891 written an interesting paper on international arbitration, which was published in the *Report of the American Historical Association* for that year, had become so enamored of the subject, that he has consulted all available sources of information, documents published and unpublished, memoirs, biographies, orations, local histories, and even public men still living who were members of these "High Courts," for interesting personal details concerning those who took part in our various mixed commissions. Nor has he confined himself to the letter of his contract, which might fairly be construed to require a discussion only of those arbitrations in which our government has been a party *litigant*, but he has furnished a full history of all those international disputes in which the President of the United States or some American jurist selected by him or agreed upon by the parties, has acted as arbitrator. Examples of these are the services of Mr. J. C. Bancroft Davis, Assistant Secretary of State in 1869, as arbitrator between Great Britain and Portugal concerning their respective claims to the island of Bulama on the west coast of Africa; of President Hayes in 1878, in settling a boundary dispute between Paraguay and the Argentine Republic; of President Cleveland in similar controversies between Costa Rica and Nicaragua, and between Brazil and the Argentine Republic, and also in the Cerruti claim brought by Italy against Colombia; of Mr. Alexander Porter Morse in the claim of Van Bokkelen against Hayti; and of the Honorable William Strong, a retired Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, in the claims of Pelletier and Lazare against the same government.

It has frequently happened that our government has itself assumed the settlement of claims of its own citizens against foreign governments. This has just occurred in the recent negotiation with Spain, and another notable instance was the arrangement with Mexico in 1848. In these cases, and also where a sum in gross is paid to the United States by a foreign government in satisfaction of claims of our citizens against it, as in the payment by Great Britain under the Geneva award, a domestic tribunal is established under authority of an act of Congress to hear and determine the individual claims. Of the eleven tribunals of this character which have been thus established, Professor Moore has given a full account in Appendix I. of his work, covering 489 pages.

In another appendix the author in his conscientious endeavor to furnish the public, regardless of the mere terms of his contract, an exhaustive treatment of this interesting and almost wholly undeveloped subject, has added voluminous historical notes relating to arbitrations prior to and during the nineteenth century. In respect of the history of arbitration in the East, in Greece, under the Roman Empire, and during the Middle Ages, Professor Moore has been much aided by the work of M. Mérignhac, entitled *Traité Théorique et Pratique de l'Arbitrage International*, from which he quotes freely.

He devotes a section of this appendix to the subject of "mediation," and gives numerous examples of its employment, one of the most notable instances of its use being a negotiation begun by our government in 1866 and concluded in 1872 for the purpose of bringing to a close the war between Spain on the one side and the allied republics of Peru, Chile, Bolivia and Ecuador on the other.

Another section relates to the various plans which have been suggested for the establishment of a permanent system of arbitration. In his paper read before the American Historical Association, Professor Moore, commenting on the wise rules which guided our nation from the first as respects our duty to neutrals, our persistent advocacy of the right of expatriation, and our contribution to the establishment of the system of extradition, found particular cause for congratulation in our constant endeavor to substitute arbitration for force in the adjustment of disputes among nations.

As early as 1832 the Senate of Massachusetts expressed an opinion in a resolution, adopted with only five dissenting votes, that "some mode should be established for the amicable and final settlement of all international disputes instead of resort to war."

Later the legislature of that state and also that of Vermont recommended by resolution that a congress of nations be convoked for the purpose of establishing an international tribunal for the adjustment of differences. Various resolutions were also reported by committees of the national Congress in the fifties, recommending that our government should secure whenever practicable a stipulation in all treaties providing for the settlement by arbitration of all international controversies. In 1874 the House of Representatives passed a resolution in favor of general arbitration. The international American conference which met in Washington in 1889 adopted a plan pledging the republics of North, Central, and South America to arbitration "as a principle of American international law for the settlement of the differences, disputes or controversies that may arise between two or more of them," but it has not been ratified by treaties.

It is still fresh in the public memory that our Congress in 1890 requested the President to invite negotiations with other governments looking to the settlement of disputes by arbitration, and that in 1893 the British House of Commons adopted a resolution which, after reciting this request, expressed the hope that Her Majesty's Government would co-operate with the United States in this respect.

These resolutions bore excellent fruit. Sir Julian Pauncefote and Secretary Gresham, and, after the latter's death, Lord Salisbury and Secretary Olney conducted an able correspondence resulting January 11, 1897, in an admirable treaty, which unfortunately failed in the Senate. However, President McKinley, who in his inaugural address said: "We want no wars of conquest; we must avoid the temptation of territorial aggression," has urged the action of the Senate on this very treaty, which was "the result of our own initiative." Professor Moore gives us the gratifying information that the subject of a permanent treaty of arbitration between the two nations is still under consideration in the Senate. The present is assuredly the most propitious time for the conclusion of such a treaty. Towards the establishment of a permanent plan of this nature at this time as respects not only Great Britain but all civilized nations, the volumes now under consideration will doubtless give an impetus.

At the end of these volumes the author has wisely added the text of all the treaties relating to arbitrations to which our government has been a party.

It is impossible within our limits to examine in detail the arbitrations which Professor Moore so fully describes, beginning in 1794, when our first trial of this method of settling disputes was made under the Jay treaty, and coming down to date. There have been fifteen of these with Great Britain, two of which were particularly noteworthy—the Geneva tribunal and the Fur Seal arbitration at Paris. With Spain we have had two, and concerning the first one—created by the treaty of 1795—Professor Moore has made a most important discovery. The impression has generally prevailed that there was never any arbitration conducted under the twelfth article of that treaty. It has been supposed that it was wholly annulled by the treaty of 1819. No records of any early commission are in the archives of the Department of State. But Professor Moore has not only produced incontestable proofs from the letters of early Secretaries of State that awards were made, but his industrious searches led to the discovery in that department of an old volume containing a copy of the awards. With France we have had but one arbitration. It related to war claims. With our neighbor Mexico we have had two. The last one of these—that of 1868—has occasioned a remarkable controversy. Mexico having attempted to show that two of the awards of Sir Edward Thornton, the umpire, in favor of American citizens, were obtained by fraud, the Secretary of State suspended the distribution of the money paid by that government upon them. The claimants sought by *mandamus* to obtain payment of these awards, but the Supreme Court of the United States denied the writ, holding that the government should not knowingly allow itself to be made the instrument of wrong in arbitration proceedings, and that as between it and its own citizens the honesty of the claims was always open to inquiry for the purpose of fair dealing with the other government. It appears that Mr. Evarts, Secretary of State, after full examination of Mexico's evidence, reported that grave doubt had been brought upon the substantial integrity of one of these claims (Benjamin Weil's), and the sincerity of the evidence as to the measure of damages in the other (La Abra Silver Mining Company's), and added that as regards the latter our national honor should require us to reconsider it only so far as the fraudulent exaggeration of the claim is concerned. But Congress was asked to provide for a more complete examination than the Secretary could give. Professor Moore has not looked with his usual care into the history of this La Abra claim, for he asserts (p. 1266), that Dr. Gardiner, a notorious rogue, who committed suicide in the Court of the District of Columbia when convicted of fraud practised upon a domestic tribunal in relation to a mine claimed by him in Mexico, "produced stronger evidence of title than that on which Sir Edward Thornton awarded larger sums on the Weil and La Abra claims." Gardiner's title was wholly forged. La Abra's was proved not only by documents, but by the examination of the vendor by Mexico herself, and besides, in the one case the proceeding was *ex parte* with no counsel to represent the government's interest, and in the other there was a real contest, each side having skilful agents, and the trial lasting five years. It is this La Abra case which is now pending before the courts of the United States. So clear was the evidence of title in the recent judicial proceedings that the government formally stipulated that it should be accepted as established.

Our government has ventured on several occasions to interfere with and even to set aside awards pronounced in favor of its citizens by arbitrators. When this has been done by means of a new treaty creating a new international tribunal for the rehearing of the same claims, as was the case in regard to the Venezuelan awards of 1866, there can be no doubt of the propriety of the course. But President Jackson in 1834 severely rebuked Congress for passing a bill affecting the payments of such awards to our citizens, reminding it that such indemnification was their exclusive property, with which neither the executive nor the legislature could properly interfere without their consent (Richardson's *Messages of the Presidents*, III. 98, 146). He added that all negotiation in reference to such matters was wholly within the competence of the executive, and that such authority could neither be constitutionally abridged nor increased by Congress.

Mr. Bayard, however, as Secretary of State did not hesitate to review and to reverse Justice Strong's award against Hayti in favor of Pelletier. He did this, too, not on account of any newly discovered evidence affecting any of the facts in the case, but because his view of the law was "in direct conflict with that reached by the learned arbitrator." Considering that the arbitrator who had been selected by Minister Preston and Secretary Frelinghuysen did not properly construe the protocol touching the subject, or understand the law relating to the jurisdiction of a country over offences committed by a merchant vessel in one of its ports, he refused to collect the award, and it was dropped. It is doubtful whether this can be considered either good law or sound policy. It is in direct conflict not only with Jackson's well-considered views, but with the opinion of Attorney-General Hoar in the Gibbes case (13 *Op.*, 19). If the same commission cannot reconsider a decision once formally delivered without a new agreement (Halleck's *International Law,* Ch. XII.), and if the executive cannot submit a claim to a new commission after it has been passed upon by the first, unless there is a treaty to that effect (Frelinghuysen v. Key, 110 U. S., 63, 73), it is preposterous to hold that the executive department itself may review the decision of an arbitrator.

E. I. Renick.

Recollections of the Civil War. With the leaders at Washington and in the Field in the Sixties. By Charles A. Dana, Assistant Secretary of War from 1863 to 1865. (New York: D. Appleton and Co. 1898. Pp. xiii, 296.)

When General Grant was under a cloud, after Shiloh, and his superiors were in a quandary whether to relieve him or not, Mr. Stanton, Secretary of War, sent Mr. Dana to his headquarters nominally to inspect the work of the paymasters but really to observe the situation in the army and report confidentially so that the Secretary might determine intelligently what to do. Mr. Dana's reports proved so reassuring, and so valuable in other ways besides, that he was kept on the field until Vicksburg fell. He was then appointed Assistant Secretary of War and sent to Chattanooga to confer with General Rosecrans upon any subject he might "desire to have brought to the notice of the department." Here he remained until after the victory of Missionary Ridge and the relief of General Burnside. Thereafter he was employed at his desk in Washington, on various short missions and especially with General Grant in Virginia. It is the story of his experiences while serving in these various capacities which he has written out and published.

"Recollections" though they are and composed for the most part at the very close of the veteran journalist's life, there was a broad foundation of recorded contemporary impressions upon which to build. There is little in the book for which the authority of dispatches from the field cannot be given. Most of Mr. Dana's reports have been printed in the *Rebellion Record.* Nearly everything of interest in them has been utilized and a few unpublished reports and family letters have also been drawn upon.

Mr. Dana's position was unique. He lived at army headquarters; he communicated unofficially and freely with all officers, low and high; he made tours of inspection both alone and with the generals; and he was a listener at the councils of war. But he had no responsibility for the success or failure of the plans adopted, and he was not bound by military law to receive commands and obey without question. It was his privilege to stand by and observe and report; to point out freely and confidentially to the Secretary at Washington the reasonableness or unreasonableness of the plans and the efficiency or inefficiency of those engaged in carrying the several parts into execution. He begged for reinforcements for Rosecrans; Grant relied on him to interest the Secretary in his plans for new campaigns; officers made complaints to him regarding those who had forfeited their confidence. But his dispatches betray no petty feelings, they are straightforward and significant and he seems to have retained the respect of all with whom he was associated, delicate as his relations with some of them must have been at times.

Mr. Dana made mistakes; in exciting emergencies his judgment was sometimes at fault; his own later dispatches often contain corrections of the earlier. Swept back into Chattanooga with the routed right wing he immediately telegraphed to Washington that Chickamauga was as fatal a name as Bull Run. Four hours later he had learned of Thomas's defence of the left wing; and step by step he analyzed the situation and pointed out the false moves, when and by whom made, as definitely as one criticizes a lost game of chess. His final statement of the matter in hand seldom fails to be convincing.

His dispatches, more frequent than those of the commanding general even and from a different standpoint, relieved the suspense of the anxious watchers in the War Department greatly, and Mr. Dana takes pains to show how much Mr. Stanton appreciated them. But it is more difficult to estimate the effect of his suggestions. In some cases the relation of act to suggestion is patent; and it is safe to infer that his dispatches commanded consideration even when they were not or could not be followed. But Mr. Dana modestly refrained from developing the point fully and it would require time, skill and patience to determine it from the records.

There is no logical unity to the book, nor any consistent purpose running through it, except to give a chronological narrative of certain interesting personal experiences. It is not broad enough in scope to show the progress of the war as a whole, nor of any special phase of it like negro contrabands or emancipation. If it might be expected to throw light particularly on the delicate question of appointment, removal and promotion in the army it is disappointing. What it does offer is Mr. Dana's opinion of the officers whom he observed. His judgments are candid, keen and analytical, showing psychological insight. They will generally command assent and must be taken into account by future writers. Space forbids a discussion of them here. Almost every current question: cotton speculations, fraud in army contracts, political influence and bargain, emancipation, negro soldiers, and many another, is touched on briefly and incidentally. A fact is stated, an observation recorded or an opinion stated which will be of great value in the hands of the historian who shall make a comprehensive study of the subject to which it relates.

The professional historian who turns to Mr. Dana's book for historical material will be guilty of negligence if he does not also consult the dispatches themselves in the *Record*. But in the *Recollections* he will find much that cannot be obtained elsewhere. First there are some letters hitherto unpublished. Then there is the setting of the recorded events as Mr. Dana has been able to recall it and there are his own interpretations which but for this book would have died with him. The general reader's interest will be held by the perspicuous descriptions of several great campaigns, by the numerous character-sketches and by many passages of a high order of literary merit.

Frederick W. Moore.

Life of Oliver P. Morton, including his important Speeches. By William Dudley Foulke. (Indianapolis, Kansas City: The Bowen-Merrill Co. 1898. Two vols., pp. 488, 593.)

In any list of a dozen men most prominent in civil life during the civil war period, Oliver P. Morton's name would pretty surely be found. He did not neglect the politician's art of keeping himself in the public eye, and whatever he did was industriously advertised by as compact and well disciplined a following as any public man could boast. Yet nobody questioned his possession of qualities which justified his prominence. Chief of these was a natural force of will which either dominated those about him and made them willing followers, or drove them into antagonism. He had the courage of a revolutionist which stuck at nothing to reach his object, and made his life a continued illustration of the proverb that "the end justifies the means." His intellect, like his body in his prime, was robust and burly. His speech was direct and clear, and he had a natural dialectical power in referring his conduct and the policy he advocated to principles and to passions that were in vogue. It was inevitable that he should be a popular leader in a troubled time. Whether he were an able demagogue or a statesman was and is the question. His biographer has given us a book which will help the historian, for it is a fair presentation of the acts and events of Morton's life, without overstraining to force them into consistency or to justify them. It shows the conventional desire of one who represents family and local pride to exalt the motives, to soften hard facts, to suggest apologies; but this is done with moderation and intelligent restraint, as well as with good literary judgment.

Morton threw himself into the movement which was organized into the Republican party, when Douglas's Kansas-Nebraska bill and the Dred

Scott decision forced the issue whether the free states should surrender their right under the Missouri Compromise to the exclusive colonizing of the great North-west. He had been a Democrat, and though comparatively young, his native characteristics made him aggressive and militant; so that when they were used against his old political associates, the resulting antagonism was sharp. He was soon well hated. The same qualities and the zeal with which he espoused his new cause made him a leader in it from the start. He signalized his advent to prominence by suggesting to the Republican majority of the Indiana Senate a "device" by which they could get rid of a Democratic member whose right to a seat was contested. The Republicans of the Senate refused to accompany the Democrats to the joint convention of the two houses to elect a Senator in Congress; but though a majority, they were not enough to make the legal quorum. Morton instructed them that when the Democratic senators were absent, they could put one of their own number in the chair, oust the objectionable member, fill his place, and by doing this without roll-call there could be no proof that a lawful quorum was not present and no means of undoing it. A confessed illegality would thus be successful. It was done accordingly, and worked like a charm. Morton's prestige in Indiana was solidified.

"Bolting" to break a quorum had become in that state a common practice, each party practising it in turn, and each in turn denouncing it as revolutionary, which, of course, it was. As parties get used to doing what they condemn in their opponents, and make it their creed that it is right to "do evil that good may come," the obscuration of the moral sense surely follows; and from bolting to defeat a "gerrymander" as the Democrats did in March, 1862, or to defeat Hendricks's election to the national Senate as the Republicans did in January, 1863, to "doctoring" election returns, or "voting 'em in blocks of five," is a *facilis descensus* which helps to make some periods of Indiana politics intelligible. Certainly it explains why the order of "Sons of Liberty" flourished more in that state than elsewhere.

Morton's term as governor of his state was for four years from January, 1861. The reaction of 1862 made the legislature Democratic for 1863–64. A bill was introduced intended to curtail the power of the governor in the organization of the militia and in the expenditure of funds appropriated for the relief of sick soldiers. The biographer tells us that the bill "showed a rather adroit compliance with the letter of the constitution while its spirit was subverted." Before the bill had passed either house, after a vote which seemed to show that it would pass that in which it originated, the Republicans, under Morton's avowed leadership, "bolted" again and broke up the quorum. The session ended without their return, all legislation was blocked, and the appropriations for ordinary expenditures of the state government were not made. Morton personally assumed the whole administration. He borrowed money from the county treasuries in Republican counties, borrowed a large sum from the Secretary of War, borrowed from bankers. He established a private treasury and auditing office, paid the interest on the state debt, the running expenses of asylums and sanitary commission and other public expenditures, refused to call an extra session of the legislature, and in the language of his biographer, "was the State" until a new election gave him friendly support again in the co-ordinate department of the government.

He was a dictator confessed. There was hardly a pretense of disguise. It was not only revolution, but there was no such peril as to make an excuse for it. The bill had not passed one house. It must pass both, and still again after he should veto it. He had promises from moderate Democrats that it should not finally pass. There was time enough to "bolt" when it came to a vote after a veto. But if it had passed it does not seem to have been terrible in its character. Annoying, even personally exasperating no doubt it was; but he could have been relied on to find lawful means of extracting its sting. The militia was not the volunteer army. This was controlled by Federal law. His appointment of officers of volunteers could not be meddled with. United States troops garrisoned the state under United States officers selected by himself. Mr. Stanton treated him as an *alter ego*. All local militia laws might have been repealed and neither state nor country would have known the difference. The historian will have to conclude that the question was one of personal pride and dignity: the action both revolutionary and precipitate. It is only by noting these characteristics of his administration in Indiana that we can understand him in his rôle of leader in reconstruction measures in the national Senate, when he had taken his seat in that body.

At the close of the war, in the autumn canvass of 1865, Morton had treated with fulness the subject of the political status of the freedmen in the South after the abolition of slavery. He had said "that however freely we may admit the natural rights of the negro, colored state governments are not desirable; that finally they will bring about a war of races . . . I would give these men, just emerged from slavery, a period of probation; I would give them time to acquire a little property, and get a little education; time to learn something about the simplest forms of business, and to prepare themselves for the exercise of political power. At the end of ten, fifteen or twenty years, let them come into the enjoyment of their political rights." This theme was enlarged upon, and we are told that "President Johnson said it was the ablest defense of his policy yet made public."

Stickling for mere formal consistency we may not ask of a public man more than of a private one. But we study with interest the reasons a public man gives for a change of attitude. By 1867 Morton had given his adhesion to the policy of which Thaddeus Stevens was the champion in Congress, and in his last message to the Indiana legislature, a few days before he was elected to the Senate, he reiterated the objections to making a governing class of a race "impressed with that character which slavery impresses on its victims," and said it "would be justified only by necessity resulting from inability to maintain loyal republican state governments in any other way." When this came later into the fiery analysis of the debates on the final reconstruction measures, it was seen that "republican" meant "Republican party."

It was, indeed, a trying situation for the leaders who had controlled the politics of the country through the war, when they found that peace and the return of the rebellious states to allegiance threatened to put the opposition into power. It was not strange that many of them lost the self-control necessary to judge reasonably what kind of government in those states was possible or tolerable, and in the stress of party conflict forgot the lessons of history and of social science. The methods which were adopted led inevitably to arraying the races solidly against each other in political struggle. It needed no gift of prophecy to tell the outcome of this.

Morton soon became chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections and absorbed into that committee the control of Reconstruction legislation. He introduced the amendment to the Reconstruction laws already complied with, by which as a further condition of admission, Virginia, Mississippi and Texas were required to adopt the Fifteenth Constitutional Amendment. These votes were thought necessary to pass it, in view of the opposition to it in Northern states. The Indiana senator formulated his doctrine that "definitions advance" and that "a republican government" might mean a different thing in one year from another.

Space will not permit the consideration of intermediate steps, and we must hasten to the events which showed the self-destructive development of Morton's system. In the Louisiana election of 1872, two contesting "returning boards" claimed the authority to decide the result. The "Republican" board had no returns, the "Liberal" had the returns and declared McEnery elected Governor. The Republican board declared Kellogg elected, and sent one of their number to Washington to inform Congress that they did not claim to have evidence of Kellogg's election, but in view of the general intimidation of the negroes, they had given a formal certificate to Kellogg for the purpose of asking Congress to set aside the whole election and order another under General Sheridan's protection.[1] It seemed that Congress generally favored doing this and a majority of Morton's own committee so reported. But Morton opposed it vehemently and carried his point. The administration had been induced to install Kellogg by military force pending Congressional action, and basing his course on a convenient form of the argument in favor of a *de facto* government, he waived aside the notice from the returning board itself that they had canvassed no returns, and added to the doctrine that "the end justifies the means," the gloss, "keep all you've got." He thus invented the improvement on the returning board of the South, by which without returns, or with those manufactured to its order, it could insure the success of the proper candidate. It only needed the device of "not to go behind the returns" to make it a theoretically perfect instrument of government. In practice it was marred by inconsistencies in his fellow-senators which disgusted Morton. They accepted its work in giving Louisiana Kellogg as governor, but they drew the line when it sent Pinchback to sit with them in the Senate chamber.

---

[1] See *The Nation*, December 17, 1896, p. 459.

The full fruition of the system came later. The men having scruples left the returning board. Their successors refused to fill a vacancy in it which the law required to be filled by one of their political opponents, and the last check upon their actions was removed. On the other side the general intimidation of the freedmen had gone so far that it was not necessary to have any violence or threats at the polls on election day. The presence of the usual party ticket-holders, checking off the voters, was enough. The necessity arose for going behind the actual election, if not behind the returns. Could an outwardly peaceable election in a precinct be set aside, and the candidate who had a minority of votes be declared elected, on the ground that the black voters had been terrorized last week or last year? The one-party board was equal to the occasion. It could exclude such precincts as it pleased, having no troublesome minority present to ask impertinent questions, or make awkward protests. Its tools afterward confessed, but one who confesses a fraud is not a very credible witness, though all courts listen to him.

A gradual conviction spread through the country that the system could not work. Committees of Congress were sent south and said much more when they came back than appeared in their official reports. In "letting it go this time," they emphasized the absolute necessity of change. Then, the Louisiana returning board was a self-perpetuating one, and there was Sheridan's word for it that its leader was a rascal. It could go on making its legislatures as well as executive officers, forever, whatever votes were actually cast. We were getting to what the French call an *impasse*. All this, scarcely veiled, appears in the biography before us.

In the counting of the electoral votes of 1876, Morton was a model of boldness and directness in his advocacy of "thorough." He applied his former invention in all its completeness. Having a Democratic House of Representatives to deal with, he had led the Senate to abrogate the 22d joint rule adopted by his party in 1865 to give each house a veto on counting the contested vote of a state. He carried logic "to the limit" (in the mathematical sense). There must be no going behind the returns. If the returning board has certified a given list of electors and the electors have sent a vote, that vote must be counted, and the President *pro tem.* of the Senate must count it. Senator Ferry, the presiding officer, was a man of delicate temperament, quite a contrast to the Indiana senator in nearly every physical and mental quality, and Morton spoke and acted as if his end was gained if he made Ferry's counting the means. There were those who knew both men who doubted whether disappointment would not have been in store for him. But he had strained his leadership too far. The Senate refused to go with him and agreed to the Electoral Commission bill, which gave to Hayes's election the sanction of a decision by a legally constituted tribunal.

How far unofficial negotiations went is not known, but the fact was that the decision was followed by Grant's withholding military interference in the organization of the Louisiana government, and the "government *de facto*" was not that certified by the returning board. To declare that the other was still the "government *de jure*" seemed a strain upon any conscience, but Morton did not falter. Then, Hayes sent commissions to negotiate a settlement in Louisiana and South Carolina, and the dissolution of the so-called Republican legislatures followed. The plan of reconstruction and perpetuation of party domination under Morton's doctrine of the right of Congress "to raise up a new loyal voting population" had failed. Ten years' struggle had left the races as hostile as ever. What had been done toward lifting the freedmen into capacity for self-government under the fostering power of the nation used in the cause of humanity and freedom? Had the adopted plan ever a chance of success? Was it intelligently adapted to the solution of the great problem? Had the end been feasible and the means honest? Was it statesmanship? The final reputation of Morton is involved in the answer. Many incidents of his career and other questions of public policy which he debated would repay examination; but the matters above discussed are, after all, those which must determine his character as a public man.

Historic Towns of New England: Edited by LYMAN P. POWELL. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1898. Pp. xxi, 599.)

THIS book, as explained by the editor in his preface, is partly the product of a tour undertaken by a party starting from Philadelphia at the close of the University Extension Summer Meeting in 1894, for "a ten days' pilgrimage in the footsteps of George Washington." But as Washington never visited half the places described in it, the book is seen to be both more and less than was originally planned for—more, because many of the towns spoken of were not included in the pilgrimage, and less, because the places outside of New England which were visited by Washington and by these pilgrims are not included in this work, but are left for a possible future publication on Historic Towns of the Middle States.

About one-half of the book consists apparently of the addresses made to the travelling party at the places actually visited; and the other half includes valuable descriptions, by different authors, of other towns, which have been added in order to give a larger representation of what New England has been in history. It would seem as if one who assumes to be the editor of such a work should at least have written the introduction. It is difficult to see what "editing" has been done, except to solicit the manuscripts and perhaps to select some of the illustrations. Each chapter is by a responsible author, who appears to have done his own editing. There is not a single foot-note by Mr. Powell. Indeed, it is rather surprising that a Pennsylvanian should undertake to give to the world a book about a section of the country with which he is not familiar, and concerning which he has not himself written a single chapter. However, he has prevailed upon fifteen writers—each of them well-known and abundantly qualified—to furnish the contents of the book; and we may well thank any man who has the enterprise to secure such a staff, and give permanent form to such excellent materials for our local and municipal history.

The Introduction by George P. Morris is a comprehensive and philosophical essay, of some fifty pages, on the characteristic institutions of New England. These are well described in the order of the Church, the Town House, the School, the Railway, the Factory and the Public Library, with brief allusions to other agencies such as the Savings Bank, the Newspaper, the Lodge and the Village Store, with a suggestive reference—in the case of a large number of towns—to the exclusion of the liquor shop.

The story of Portland is narrated by Samuel T. Pickard. The illustrations are too few for so important a city. The quiet and recently-discovered hill-town of Rutland in Worcester County is described by Mr. Mead, whose enthusiasm for Rufus Putnam and Manasseh Cutler and "the Ordinance of 1787" and the founding of Ohio is second only to that of Senator Hoar. The annals and treasures of Salem are unfolded by George D. Latimer with appropriate illustrations. Col. Higginson tells of the topography and growth of Boston, of its patriots and statesmen and literati, its charities and libraries and museums. Dr. Hale gives one of his popular papers on Revolutionary Boston. Samuel A. Eliot treats of Cambridge with special reference to its university. Concord, first in many fields, is safe in the hands of Frank B. Sanborn. Ellen Watson writes feelingly of Plymouth which she knows so well. The reader is somewhat surprised to find Cape Cod Towns honored with a chapter. They have too often been overlooked. Katharine Lee Bates writes of them all, beginning with Provincetown and ending with Falmouth. She has evidently studied the Cape and prepared one of the best general accounts of it ever written. The marine view on p. 347 is uncommonly good.

No one could tell the thrilling story of Deerfield better than George Sheldon, who has done so much for the Pocumtuck Valley Memorial Association and for its unrivalled museum of relics. A fine portrait of George Fuller is given on p. 437, but there is no mention of him in the text to show that he was a son of Deerfield. Here was an opportunity for the editor to supply the deficiency. Newport, the Isle of Peace, with its peculiar attractions, is pleasantly described by Susan Coolidge; and Providence, the Colony of Hope, is sketched by William B. Weeden, who honors the unique record of its plantations, its churches, its industries, its college, its men, its ideas. Mary K. Talcott writes of Hartford; and Frederick H. Cogswell of New Haven.

The illustrations are numerous and unusually good throughout the book. Some of them have appeared in magazines and other publications. They are all welcome here. The frontispiece is unwisely reproduced on p. 323. The book is too heavy to hold conveniently in the hand. Considering the composite character of the work, its unity is well maintained and the chapters are all of a high order.

Municipal History and Present Organization of the City of Chicago. By SAMUEL EDWIN SPARLING, Ph.D. [Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, No. 23.] (Madison, Wisconsin: the University. 1898. Pp. 188.)

OF the seventeen chapters in this book, six, comprising about one-quarter of the space, are given to the history of the city government of Chicago from 1833 to 1872. The rest of the book is devoted to a description of the present organization of the city government as developed under the act of 1872.

The author aims to show in the first part how the germs of municipal government contained in the village charter of 1833 grew into the highly complicated organism of 1898. He traces the evolution of the power of the mayor as the central thought of this development from the time when he was simply the presiding officer of the village board of trustees, elected by the board, entrusted with little or no initiative power, granted little or no control over legislation or administration, to the present, when, having achieved an independent position, elected by popular vote, though still the presiding officer of the council, he has become the acknowledged head of the administration, and even a powerful element in the legislative body itself. A description is given of the process by which the system of independent administrative boards was gradually evolved out of the old village board of trustees, and of the methods by which, when these boards had done their work, they were converted into a system of administrative departments under single heads responsible to the mayor.

The later chapters, comprising two-thirds of the book, are given to an exposition of the present organization of the various city departments. The following titles of several of the chapters indicate the line of development: The Common Council; The Mayor and His Functions; The Administration of Finance; Department of Public Works; Institutions for Protection and Education—Police, Fire, Health, Schools; Town and County Government in Chicago; The Park Administration. A bibliography of some ten pages contains a list of the sources from which the author drew his material, including a chronological arrangement of the laws relating to the government of the city passed by the legislature of Illinois. It is unfortunate that no index accompanies the work, though the table of contents, being quite full, makes up in some part for the omission.

It is evident that within the limits of a monograph of less than 200 pages with wide margins and few foot-notes, only a mere outline of such a complicated and comprehensive subject as that of the city government of Chicago can be given. It is also plain that where the attempt is made to cover the whole ground, little more can be done than to utilize in a more or less sketchy way the sources of information most easily accessible. Those persons therefore who have worked over this material at all fully will find little that is new in this monograph. The laws of the state, the ordinances of the city, the proceedings of the council since 1872, the local histories of varying value, and the newspapers to a limited extent, have been drawn upon by the author. Little attempt has been made, if one may judge from the traces of the effort in the monograph itself, to work over in detail the enormous mass of material contained in the newspapers and in the ephemeral pamphlet literature of the last fifty years, so that the field of original research is still left almost untouched for future monographic effort.

On the other hand, the work of giving a fairly satisfactory outline history of the municipal government has been well done, and the description of the existing system of administration is, if not altogether adequate, the best account thus far furnished within anything like the same number of pages. The book is on the whole a substantial contribution to the subject which it discusses. It will be of considerable use even to the special student who has worked over the field, and in the present state of the literature on the subject will be well-nigh indispensable to the students of our municipal institutions who wish to know something of Chicago and its development, and yet have not access to the original sources. The book is distinctly superior to the common run of monographs submitted for the doctor's degree. An epigrammatic style interferes with the pleasure of reading the work, and there are evidences that the author has yielded to the temptations common to such a style, and said things often in such an epigrammatic way that the sense is concealed for all but himself. Many misprints disfigure the pages, which is all the more to be regretted as the general typographical appearance of the book is distinctly pleasing.

Histoire de la Seigneurie de Lauzon. Par J. EDMOND ROY, Membre de la Société Royale du Canada, Maire de la ville de Lévis. (Lévis, en vente chez l'auteur, 9 rue Wolfe. 1897, 1898. Two vols., pp. viii, v, lxiii, 495, lxxxvi; 416, lxii, v.)

IT is almost startling to find the mayor of a town in America who is engaged in active political life, devoting the spare time of ten years to historical research. M. Roy is mayor of the considerable town of Lévis opposite Quebec. The surrounding tract of country composes the seigneurie of Lauzon. The huge buildings and glittering spires of Lévis look imposing from the terrace at Quebec, and the place itself has had an eventful history. It was from its heights that Wolfe bombarded Quebec in 1759. So long ago as 1635, the seigneurie was originally established, and for concessions made in 1653 masses are still said annually in the parish of St. Nicolas for Mme. de Charmy, wife of a former seigneur. In this and adjoining seigneuries land has been held by the same families in unbroken succession for more than two hundred years. Th. Bentzon, writing recently in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, pointed out that the ownership of land has witnessed relatively fewer changes in Quebec than in France, which is not what one expects in the New World.

French feudalism, planted in Canada amid conditions so different from those native to it, is an interesting study. M. Roy, with minute detail, describes in these two volumes the history of a feudal domain for rather more than one hundred years. His work for the present ends with the British conquest of Canada in 1759; but feudalism did not perish in Canada at that time. The Quebec Act of 1774, to the disgust of the English colonies, provided for the continuance of the old French system. The *habitant*, who had then been free for the fifteen years since the conquest, was brought once more under the sway of his lord. This sway never became a real tyranny, but the lord's rights were irritating and restrictive, and the whole system, after enduring under British rule for three quarters of a century, was in the end swept away about fifty years ago.

The daily life of the people, living amid conditions so foreign to America, is of great interest; and it is this which should attract to M. Roy's volumes the attention of the larger world. He is not a picturesque writer, and he has been embarrassed by a wealth of material. He can tell us the names of all the dwellers within the seigneurie at almost any date. Not a church-warden, not a pew-holder, hardly a volume in the priest's library, escapes his notice. Obviously such work is mainly of local import, yet from it much of wider import can be gleaned. We see the seigneur in Canada as in France claiming the customary respect from the church. He has the seat of honor with his armorial bearings over it. His name and that of his wife are mentioned in the public prayers. Between him and his vassals there is a social gulf. They come to him for fatherly advice, and he corrects their faults. He lives in state, rude indeed, but not wanting in dignity. To his bakery, his mill, his tannery the people are obliged to come for the various services required. Nor was the life of the peasant one of mere dull routine. The seigneurie of Lauzon lay on the route from Quebec to the New England settlements, and some aspects of the ferocious border warfare between the French and the English can be found in these volumes.

These intermittent struggles reached their climax in the great siege of Quebec in 1759, *l'année terrible* as M. Roy calls it. We get here a side of the narrative hardly touched upon in Parkman's *Montcalm and Wolfe*, the terror of the French peasantry, the solemn litanies in the churches frequented by crowds, in the end the flight of almost the entire population to the woods. M. Roy tells the tale, not dramatically but with minute care. It is the life of his own people that he is describing. Never does he show any bitterness toward the English conqueror, though he is always true, in tone, to France. This of itself is an indication that the war of races is almost dead in Canada. The most patriotic of French Canadians glory in the British institutions which they enjoy. At the present day in the seigneurie of Lauzon dwell some thirty thousand people, French and Catholic almost to a man. If Great Britain and France were at war, they would find themselves in a terrible dilemma; yet their leaders are even passionately devoted to Great Britain, which has been almost too generous in leaving them their former system unimpaired.

The pagination of M. Roy's volumes is remarkable. He makes some trifling errors such as "Sir Logan" for Sir William Logan (I. xlvii), and his sense of proportion is sometimes defective; few have heard of the "celebrated" novelist Frances Brooke (I. 25). The book is however a sound and scholarly piece of historical work, far superior to the average local history published in English. The care with which records are preserved in French Canada is probably unequalled elsewhere in the world. This fosters a taste for genealogy and there is scarcely a family that cannot trace its ancestry back for many generations. One result is a civic patriotism that has produced an admirable series of local histories.

George M. Wrong.

Mexico and the United States; a Study of Subjects affecting their Political, Commercial and Social Relations, made with a view to their Promotion. By Matias Romero. Vol. I. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1898. Pp. xxxiv, 759.)

D. Matias Romero was appointed Secretary to the Mexican Legation at Washington in 1859, and for nearly twenty-five of the years between that date and his death in December last, he resided in the United States as the diplomatic representative of Mexico. Throughout this period he devoted himself with earnest intelligence and with unremitting diligence to the task of developing by every legitimate means more intimate relations between the neighboring republics. Possessed of solid qualities rather than brilliant talents, his work attracted comparatively little attention even from those whom it affected most directly, but his long term of almost uniformly pleasant and successful service gave him a position of distinct influence in official circles at Washington and with the representatives of commercial interests in the large cities. He was frequently called upon by influential organizations, by learned societies and by magazine editors to explain the problems which complicate relations with our South American neighbors and to throw light upon the puzzling questions whose solution demands an understanding of the social and political characteristics of the Mexican people. His responses to these various demands have contained a very large amount of information upon many sides of Mexican life and history. Written by one of the best informed Mexicans of his generation for the people of the United States, whose wants and ideas he had come to understand very thoroughly, these papers have for some time been regarded by those best acquainted with Mexico as among the most reliable of the sources of information available to English readers.

Almost the last important service rendered by Señor Romero to the two republics which he served so faithfully was the revision of the more important of these occasional essays and addresses for publication in permanent form. The statistical and geographical notes, originally prepared for the American Geographical Society, were carefully corrected and wherever feasible completed by the most recent data obtainable from the officials in Mexico, the whole being arranged so as to give an extended descriptive account of the actual condition of Mexico in its various physical aspects. The articles on the silver question, on the problems of wages and labor, on tariff relations and on the Pan-American movement were expanded by the ideas and the supplementary facts which had been brought to his attention since their first publication. Where the expression of his opinion had given rise to controversies, Señor Romero carefully explained the grounds upon which objection was made to his statements, inserting also his replies and such confirmatory data as he could secure. Putting all these things together, Señor Romero was able to provide his publishers with material for a bulky volume which contains the most trustworthy available compendium of all sorts of information relating to modern Mexico.

The more strictly historical portion of this volume is based upon two articles which appeared originally in the *North American Review* in 1895 and 1897, and which in their revised form are entitled, "Genesis of Mexican Independence" and "Philosophy of Mexican Revolutions." Both papers have been considerably enlarged and to some extent rewritten; minor errors have been corrected, objections to theories or to statements of fact answered, and one or two important recent works on the most exciting period of Spanish American history drawn upon for additional data. All this fills a hundred large pages which contain a lucid account of the course of the vital events by which Mexico and her sister republics to the south won their independence from Spain, and of the subsequent events which showed the Mexican people the disadvantages of political controversies conducted by force of arms. Señor Romero's idea, however, in writing these papers was largely philosophical. His essays were intended to explain to the people of the United States that their southern neighbors are able to take care of themselves, and that they are not afflicted with an incurable desire for revolutionary turmoil and physical political disturbance. It is, therefore, from this point of view that any criticism of his arguments ought to be directed. Agreement with his main thesis is easy, to the extent that it is beyond question a great deal nearer the truth than is the current conception of the Spanish American peoples derived from Mr. R. H. Davis and other newspaper reporters or casual visitors. As for the facts stated by Señor Romero, detailed criticism is of little value in the existing condition of knowledge respecting the history of Spanish America during the first half of the nineteenth century. The events of these years have been narrated by many writers, and the prosperous governments of the southern republics have recognized their obligations to their liberators by publishing voluminous series of documents connected with every phase of the struggle for independence. There can be no doubt that the facts of this period will some day be made intelligible. It is quite as true that no satisfying exposition of the significance of these events has yet been given. The Spanish American appreciates to a remarkable extent the curious but indubitable fact that the important thing for the world to know is never what actually happened in the historical past, but is rather the thing which is said to have happened. Inasmuch as something must have happened, it becomes necessary, from this point of view, not to find out what that thing was, but for historical writers to agree upon what it may fairly be supposed to have been. Being essentially logical by birth and breeding, the Spanish American historians are able to assume the truth of the accepted narrative of the course of events during the revolutionary period. It is quite beside the question to ask whether such were really the facts and the motives which governed the succession of events and the development of character among the leaders in the struggle. Such it is agreed that they were, and as such they must be accepted until a more searching and less logical study of the character of individuals and the nature of events has been made. There are, indeed, difficulties in the existing situation, as Señor Romero might have thought had he noticed the cases—comparatively rare in his revised work—where he has occasion to make diametrically opposed statements of fact within a few paragraphs of each other. But each statement is derived from authoritative printed works, and each admirably illustrates the point which ought to be brought out in its particular connection.

Señor Romero has given English readers a very useful summary of the accepted facts of a most interesting period of Mexican history, and he has expounded certain important conclusions which, whether they follow from the facts or not, unquestionably are based upon an intimate and accurate knowledge of the Spanish American character, frankly recognizing its weaknesses and its misunderstood strength.

G. P. W.

Modern Political Institutions. By SIMEON E. BALDWIN, LL.D. (Boston: Little, Brown and Co. 1898. Pp. 378.)

THIS volume consists of a brief introduction and twelve essays mostly based upon addresses given before the American Bar Association, the American Social Science Association and bar associations of different states. All deal with political and legal institutions, especially those of the United States, laying emphasis upon their development and social significance.

Four of them are particularly legal in substance and suggest reforms that may be brought about either by legislation or by an improvement in our methods of legal procedure. The essay on "The Exemption of the Accused from Examination in Criminal Proceedings" expresses the opinion that it would further the ends of justice, if we were to adopt in part the Continental system in the preliminary examination of criminals and have the committing magistrate secure a statement from the accused which might be used in the trial.

The essay on the "Decadence of the Legal Fiction," while recognizing the value, even the necessity, of the legal fiction in earlier times under the circumstances of undeveloped communities, asserts that in the nineteenth century in our country this legal "sham" is no longer needed, and that in a court of justice it is not merely useless, but harmful.

In an address delivered before the American Social Science Association in 1886 upon the recognition of habitual criminals as a class to be treated by itself, the author takes account of the Bertillon system of detecting criminals, of the danger that the habitual criminal brings to society, and of the need of more efficient systems of restraint than are ordinarily found in our states. It is recommended that the habitual criminal, after his term of imprisonment has expired, should be released from confinement, but be kept under police supervision more or less strict as his condition requires, for the rest of his life.

In three of the essays which are peculiarly historical in their nature, Judge Baldwin traces briefly the development of American jurisprudence and constitutional law, enumerating the leading steps in legal reform by constitutional interpretation, legislation and constitutional changes. In one of them, on the "Centenary of Modern Government," the outlook is wider; the development of modern political institutions, European and American, is briefly traced, and in a most suggestive manner there is depicted the stage of civilization now reached as compared with that of a century ago.

The essays on "Salaries for Members of the Legislature" and "Permanent Courts of International Arbitration" advocate payment of salaries to legislators, and the establishment of a permanent Court of International Arbitration between England and the United States, but not among nations of differing languages and political customs; while another expresses the opinion that the Monroe Doctrine is still to be upheld in the spirit in which it was interpreted by President Cleveland in 1896.

The essay in the book which shows evidence of the most thorough research is the one on "Freedom of Incorporation." In this is traced the history of corporations through their different forms from the time of the ancient Romans to the present day. The significance of these corporations at different times, the economic and social conditions which led to their establishment, the abuses to which in course of time they gave rise, the consequent popular hostility in several cases which led to their more or less complete suppression are sketched briefly, but clearly; and the causes which have led in the last half of the present century to the general freedom of incorporation and to the enormous development of corporate enterprises are most admirably described.

Perhaps the most suggestive chapter and the one which is most likely to meet with opposition from students of political science is that on "Absolute Power: an American Institution." So many of our later writers on political science have expressed the opinion that the legislative departments of modern governments, including our own, have a tendency to absorb the prerogatives of the executive, and so many persons are inclined to believe that this supposed tendency is a good one, that one may well welcome this powerful address which shows that the President of the United States holds a position which, in case of need, gives him absolute power. This is, perhaps, the ablest brief study that has yet been made of the gradual development of the presidency. Judge Baldwin is evidently of the opinion that the executive, with all his power, in no way threatens the freedom of the people, or the perpetuity or excellence of our American institutions; but that, on the contrary, the development of this office along the lines which he has traced has been one of the strongest safeguards of all that is excellent in our republican government.

Several of these essays show the marks of their origin, as addresses delivered before associations of specialists, but this form of the essay, for which the author seems inclined to apologize in his introduction, is not at all to be censured; it but gives an added interest and liveliness to the style. On the other hand, it would have given added value to the book if some of the addresses given many years ago had been brought down to date. That on the "First Century's Changes in our Constitutions," for example, was given in 1879. It is of course true that the century ended then; but one reads this address now with a feeling of disappointment, because attention is not called even by foot-notes to the important later changes. Labor has been saved, but the added satisfaction to the reader would have been more than enough to pay for the trouble of the additions, and for the sake of the added information, the reader would have gladly excused any inconsistency with the title.

All the essays show the wide reading, the keenness of insight into customs and institutions, and the judicial temper of the author. It is particularly pleasing just at the present time, when many of our prominent citizens are lamenting what they believe to be the inclination of our people to abandon the principles of the fathers, to note the cheerful optimism with which so experienced and conservative a thinker as Judge Baldwin looks upon our institutions. He believes in them, and though he sees their faults and throughout this book is continually making suggestions for their improvement,—suggestions which our law-makers and judges will do well to heed,—he nevertheless believes that they are developing in the right direction, and that their future is full of promise.

JEREMIAH W. JENKS.

Alla Ricerca della Via Caecilia, by N. Persichetti, (Rome, 1898, pp. 28). In the year 1872–1873 an inscription (C. I. L., VI., 3824) was discovered relating to the Via Caecilia. In 1896 Dr. Huelsen published a monograph on the inscription. In this he proved that the Via Caecilia was named from L. Caecilius Metellus Diadematus, consul in B. C. 117, to whom it probably owed its origin. He also arrived at the conclusion that this road was a branch of the Via Salaria and was built to afford a more direct means of communication between Rome and the Adriatic.

We now have another admirable monograph treating of this same subject but from a different point of view. The writer has carefully collected all the archaeological and topographical evidences relating to the existence of this road and has made use of the few hints to be found in modern literature which could throw any light on the subject of his investigation. He has found unmistakable traces of the Via Caecilia in six places between the river Farfa where it branches off from the Via Salaria and Amiternum near which it again unites with this road. His conclusions are in the main in harmony with those of Dr. Huelsen. He maintains, however, that the Via Caecilia does not afford a shorter route between Rome and Amiternum than the Via Salaria. He finds the justification for its existence in its strategic and commercial value. It appears probable that the Via Caecilia after leaving Amiternum led to the sea by a shorter route ending at Castrum Novum or Ad Salinas while the Via Salaria led to Asculum and Castrum Truentinum. We trust that the writer will continue his investigations in relation to this road and will at an early date give us the results.

ALBERT GRANGER HARKNESS.

In Fasc. III. of Tom. XVII. of the *Analecta Bollandiana* Abbé A. Legris presents a careful study of the interpolated lives of the six saints who belonged to the monastery of Fontenelle during the first half-century of its existence (649–700), vindicating for them, incidentally, a greater value than has hitherto been assigned to them. A life of the Carmelite Saint Albert of Trapani is given from a Vatican manuscript. Fasc. IV., which completes the volume, contains the text of the manuscript of the *Libellus de Inventione Sanctae Crucis* preserved in the Bibliotheca Angelica. Abbé Duchesne, head of the French School at Rome, replies at length to the bitter polemic which Dr. Bruno Krusch, in the *Neues Archiv*, Vol. XXIV., directed against Duchesne and De Rossi's edition of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, printed in the second November volume of the *Acta Sanctorum*. Reply is also made to Professor Ehrhard of Vienna, on the subject of the menology of Simeon Metaphrastes. In appendixes to the two *fasciculi*, ninety-six more pages of the catalogue of the Greek hagiographical manuscripts of the Vatican Library are printed.

The number of good books on Mohammedanism is fortunately growing steadily, if not rapidly, and it is now our pleasant duty to call attention to another one, namely: *Mohammeds Lehre von der Offenbarung quellenmässig untersucht* von Dr. Otto Pautz (Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, pp. 304). In this work Doctor Pautz devotes himself to a systematic study of Mohammed's religious teaching, and mentions only such facts in the prophet's life as are essential to a proper understanding of that teaching. The author has made a careful study of the Koran itself and of several of the best-known commentators and historians, and shows wide acquaintance with the works of western scholars who have written on Mohammed and Islam. The work is written in a very liberal spirit, and no western reader will be likely to accuse Doctor Pautz of failing in appreciation of Mohammed's character and religious activity. Moreover, while believing the Christian religion superior to Islam, the author fully recognizes the good points of the latter religion, and, in the matter of religious earnestness and morality, draws comparisons between the adherents of the two beliefs not at all flattering to his own co-religionists. It will not be possible, in the space at our disposal, to discuss the book in detail, but we shall call attention to one or two points. In the section on Mohammed and the contemporary soothsayers and poets, there is an excellent discussion of some of the literary characteristics of the Koran. Dr. Pautz examines the passages which are commonly quoted to prove that predestination is taught in the Koran, and concludes that this doctrine was not part of the Koranic teaching. The author's own discussion of this point, and the long list of references which he gives to the works both of those who agree and of those who disagree with him on this point, will be of great help to a student seeking to arrive at an independent decision on this important question.

After an interesting comparison of the different accounts of the same occurrences given in the Bible and in the Koran, Dr. Pautz concludes that, whether Mohammed could or could not read and write, he did not, as a matter of fact, make use of any written sources, either Jewish or Christian, but depended on oral information obtained in his intercourse with Jews and Christians.

The book is provided with indexes of the transcribed Arabic words given in the body of the work, and of the passages quoted from the Koran and the Old and New Testaments. A list of additions and corrections concludes the work. It is a pity that the author has not added a full analytical table of contents and an index of subjects, for he would have increased not a little the usefulness of a book which deserves, and will repay, careful study. J. R. J.

It is not likely that any one will expect to find in Watson's *Story of France* (Macmillan, Vol. I., pp. xv, 712) the results of original investigation, or look to it for an authoritative settlement of doubtful matters. It is plainly addressed to the great public, and they will find it abundantly interesting. The style is "breezy" and unconventional, with an occasional bit of dialect, and the author has an eye for the picturesque and for striking contrasts. As to the general accuracy, in the parts of the book which relate to the ordinary course of political events the writer seems to have followed better authorities than in those which deal with religion, manners and customs, and general civilization. The history of medieval times is less accurate, as was to be expected, than of modern. The chapter on Feudalism might have been written from Walter Scott, with a liberal misunderstanding of terms, but that on the Reformation is nearly as far from a real knowledge of the age in matters of detail. Indeed, Mr. Watson seems to have allowed a free rein to his feelings in writing of the iniquities of the Catholic Church, and to have kept them under a stricter control than would have been anticipated in defining the theories of John Law and showing how they worked in practice. The preface frankly states that the book is history written with a purpose, and no one has a right to complain who is thus forewarned.

The series of "Oxford Manuals of English History," edited by Mr. C. W. C. Oman, has now been completed with the publication of the volume, of which the editor is the author, *England and the Hundred Years' War, 1327–1485* (Scribner, pp. 168). Whether there is a *raison d'être* for a history of England in this form probably need not concern anyone very much except the authors and the publishers. If they find a market for it, then for them it has a *raison d'être.* In this country there would seem to be little demand for separate text-books upon these periods, and the work is not quite up to the mark for collateral reading. The present volume is characterized by a certain prominence given to social and economic history, and even more by the amplitude of personal history. A good deal of this latter is valuable for side-lights, but some of it might better have been left for the teacher's gossipy quarter-hour. Military matters are generally well handled. Dates are not unnecessarily obtrusive, and the practice of frequently giving the day of the month as well as the year will often help to keep events in their proper relations. There are a few maps and plans of battles and genealogical tables. Since there are some there ought to be more.

In *Deux Études sur Goethe* (Paris, Hachette, pp. 199) M. Michel Bréal treats of "Un Officier de l'Ancienne France" and "Les Personnages Originaux de la 'Fille Naturelle.'"

M. Bréal gives to his "Studies" both historical and literary worth by his thorough investigation of the sources to which Goethe was indebted. The "Officier" is the Graf Thorane, described in the third book of Goethe's *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, who so impressed the youthful poet while quartered at his father's house, as governor of Frankfort during part of the Seven Years' War. Concerning the character and career of the French count, really François de Théas, Comte de Thorenc, M. Bréal explains many of Goethe's allusions. This review of his important public services at home and abroad, mostly unknown to Goethe, of his private life and temperament, will aid the reader of *Dichtung und Wahrheit* in answering many natural questions.

An equally minute and a more lengthy examination is made of the occurrences suggesting the plan of Goethe's *Natürliche Tochter* and of the single and composite characters in this incomplete trilogy on the French Revolution. We get a vivid picture of Stéphanie-Louise, the original of *Eugenie.* By literary comparisons and citations from comparatively unfamiliar history, M. Bréal strengthens his estimate of Goethe's method, and hopes to improve on existing criticisms of the piece by more careful study of Goethe's model and of the intended sequel. Reasoning from the concluding scene of the tragedy, from notes left by the poet, and from letters recently published, he is convinced of Goethe's general plan even to the trend that the third part would have taken.

The "Notes et Documents" included in the volume, with an autograph of Princess Stéphanie, give completion to this painstaking criticism of M. Bréal.

No better evidence could be found of the increasing interest of the public in the history of the British Empire and of England's colonial policy than the numerous books on one subject or the other, including even series of books, which have appeared within the past two or three years. Most of these are addressed to this popular interest and make no claim to more investigation than enough to get correctly the general facts of history or biography. Even Greswell's *British Colonies* is a disappointment, for though the book appears in one of the popular series, and is somewhat above the average of such books, the author is so thoroughly familiar with the later history of the Empire that some increase of our knowledge is reasonably to be expected from him even in a short and popular book. Worthy of some praise indeed is his clear account of the various changes in governments and constitutions during the Victorian age.

There is, however, one book on the subject which stands in a class by itself. Egerton's *Short History of British Colonial Policy*, published in 1897 (London, Methuen, pp. xv, 503), is a thorough and critical study, from the sources, of England's policy from Gilbert and Raleigh to the present time. State papers, debates in Parliament, the writings of men connected with colonial affairs, and all sources likely to throw light on the government's policy are carefully examined. Nor is the author a mere investigator. Instructive comment, explanation and criticism accompany the narrative from the beginning. Especially deserving of study are the account of the troubles leading to the American Revolution, where Mr. Egerton holds that the English government were legally in the right but that their action was a "political crime," and the history of the decline of the *laissez-aller* principles. In this last instance one is inclined to regret that the author limits himself too closely to the policy of the government, and does not give us the history, which is still unwritten, of the great change in popular feeling about the colonies which took place after the middle of this century and which really was the cause of the change in heart of the government. One volume, which covers so long a period, is necessarily a "short history," but it has not been made short in this case by the sacrifice of thoroughness, or by slighting any important phase of colonial policy. The book cannot be overlooked by one who is interested in any side of colonial history. Mr. Egerton divides his subject into periods and his dividing dates are worthy of notice. He gives 50 pages to the period of beginnings, to 1650; 220 to that of trade ascendancy, to 1830; nearly 80 to that of systematic colonization, to 1860; 90 to that of the zenith and decline of the *laissez-aller* principles, to 1885; and 30 to the period of Greater Britain which follows.

The Autobiography of a Veteran, 1807–1893, by General Count Enrico della Rocca (Macmillan), has two strong claims to attention. First, it gives the testimony of an eye-witness of many of the most striking events in the history of Italy during this century; and secondly, it unfolds, with soldierly straightforwardness, an interesting personality. In his bluntness, honesty and candor Della Rocca reminds one of Gen. W. T. Sherman, but in addition to these qualities he has also the tact and *savoir faire* of a diplomatist. The student of Italian history will read these reminiscences to get new or corroborative material concerning the character of Charles Albert; the wars of 1848–1849, of 1859, 1860 and 1866; the negotiations between Cavour and Napoleon III.; the September Convention; the alliance between Italy and Prussia; with some casual hints of later politics down to 1878. In a few cases Della Rocca's statements have almost the novelty of revelation. Thus, he describes how, on the day before the battle of Solferino, Napoleon asked Victor Emanuel to ride alone with him for the ostensible purpose of reconnoitering. The King did so, bidding Della Rocca, his aide, to accompany them; and then Napoleon read a letter from Eugénie which, as Della Rocca expresses it, "was a tacit retractation by the Emperor of his promise to free Italy from the Alps to the Adriatic." Della Rocca confirms, by the way, the best previous reports of the unpreparedness of the French for the battle of Solferino. Fortunately for the success of the campaign, the Austrian generals were one degree more incompetent than the French. That MacMahon should have been given a marshal's baton and a dukedom for his performance at Magenta proves how determined Louis Napoleon was to make the most of his martial experiments.

On the middle ground between history and biography Della Rocca is particularly interesting. He throws light, fugitive but often vivid, on the famous personages amongst whom he moved. Who else has given us a glimpse of Charles Albert, sitting on the edge of a billiard table, dangling his long legs floorwards, recounting his travels and mimicking to perfection the voices and manners of the persons he had met? Della Rocca confesses that although he had frequent intercourse with Charles Albert for over twenty years, he never really understood his puzzling character until after his death—a statement which may be recommended to those persons who still find it hard to understand how Charles Albert could have been suspected by both Liberals and Retrogrades at the same time. Della Rocca's account of Victor Emanuel is still more intimate and entertaining, and adds several characteristic anecdotes of that really great king, who was never so happy as when he could "give full scope to his natural instincts and tastes, and become a *mousquetaire* of the seventeenth century." Henceforth no one who expects to comprehend the king who united Italy can overlook these reminiscences. The volume contains many other points of interest, and not the least of its merits is its unfolding of the life and character of Della Rocca himself. He has put in many of those slight personal bits which serve even better than mere political or military recollections, to keep an autobiography alive. His pictures of old Turin in the first and second decades of the century, and of his family, should be compared with similar passages in Massimo d'Azeglio's *Ricordi.* Here and there he quotes letters and documents, but in the main he is less formal and more readable. It should be added that he began these memoirs at the age of eighty-six. The English version, by Mrs. Janet Ross, is a condensation in one volume of the two volumes of the original. She has usually omitted with good judgment, chiefly the veteran's discursive narrative of military affairs—and, except for some slipshod expressions, her style is readable; but there is considerable confusion in the spelling of proper names, and the proof-reading is weak.

It is apparent that there is a new and praiseworthy local interest in the historical origins of the metropolis. In some measure this encouraging sentiment has sprung from that antiquarian and genealogical enthusiasm which has recently filled the country with various "Sons" and "Daughters" of resounding parentage and has impelled so many people of leisure to investigate their right to wear the decorations of the new orders of nobility. It is principally this family scrap-book history which may be found in Mrs. John King Van Rensselaer's *Goede Vrouw of Mana-ha-ta at Home and in Society, 1609–1760* (Scribner, pp. xxii, 418). The *Goede Vrouw* is said to be the name of the ship in which the first Van Rensselaer expedition came to America, but it is the typical Dutch housewife of the colonial aristocracy whom the author has in mind. She has compiled what she herself calls "a conglomerate history of the lives" of eight pioneer women of New Amsterdam. To the names and more especially to the marriages of these mothers in Israel the author has contrived to attach, in the first place, the usual outline of the colonial history down to 1760. In the second place she has surrounded the probable home life of her heroines with an interesting and heterogeneous collection of information about clothes and food, marriage and funeral customs, domestic architecture, amusements, real-estate titles, old landmarks, and everything else that a well-filled scrap-book should contain. The author evinces a commendable ingenuity in piecing together, but it cannot be said that she has overcome the real difficulty of presenting such facts in a lucid and systematic manner. Thus, in Chapter X., on "The Passing of the Pioneers," we pass suddenly from obituaries and eulogies to paragraphs on these topics: "The food of the early colonists; Introduction of vegetables into the colony; Patriotic crabs; Manufactory of salt; Poems on fish." Again in Chapter XX., the generations of the Alexander family and the Negro Panic of 1741 are fused in story under the mysterious title "Matches, Batches and Despatches."

In the third place, Mrs. Van Rensselaer has dexterously woven in among the bills of fare and descriptions of social customs a tolerably complete genealogical introduction to a dozen or more families, descendants of the pioneer women of Manhattan. A genealogical table, somewhat inadequate in respect to dates, helps to trace the various descents. This family line is the thread on which is hung the greater part of the story in this volume. There does not seem to be much to tell of any of these people except what they ate, drank and wore, and how frequently they were married. The wealth of personal allusion and family history in the book will attract the attention of all who are interested in the early settlers of New York, but for the benefit of these readers the author should enlarge her index and amend some of her too hasty references. It is scarcely true that Quakers were "fried" in Massachusetts (p. iii); or that the Duke of York in 1664 (p. 121) could be influenced by the colonial successes of William Penn; or that Irish emigrants settled in Londonderry, Mass. (p. 158); or that the Dutch church in the fort was a Lutheran church (p. 194); or that the Livingstons (p. 384) were all "graduates of English colleges." Most of the Livingstons were, like John Morin Scott also, graduates of Yale.

The Statute Law Book Co., of Washington, D. C., issued in August 1898 an excellent facsimile reprint of the *Temporary Acts and Laws of His Majesty's Province of New Hampshire*, printed by Daniel Fowle of Portsmouth. It is a small folio of 49 pages, and contains, as a matter of fact, a reprint of six separately printed pieces, which came from Fowle's press between the years 1761 and 1768. The originals are very rare. Indeed, this reprint is made from the "only complete copy known." They are not in the catalogue of the Charlemagne Tower collection. Sabin does not record them; and the New York Public Library has only a few (pp. 1–28) of them, bound with the Acts and Laws of 1761.

The whole collection of *Acts* and *Temporary Acts* was reprinted by the state of New Hampshire in 1887; but not page for page, or in facsimile. In that edition, too, pp. 47–49 of the *Temporary Acts* were omitted. The facsimile before us is the first *complete* and only satisfactory reprint which we have. The edition is limited to fifty copies.

V. H. P.

The Life and Times of James Hunter, "General" of the Regulators, an address by Joseph M. Morehead, at Guildford Battle Ground, July 3, 1897 (Second Corrected and Enlarged Edition, Greensboro, C. F. Thomas, printer, 1898, pp. 67) is a defence of the Regulators based chiefly on the documents in the *Colonial Records of North Carolina.* The case for the Regulators, as justly revolting against the unbearable oppression of provincial and county officials, is very well sustained. But Major Morehead goes farther, and insists, as others have done, that the war of the Regulation was rebellion against the King of Great Britain. This point is not so well sustained, though there is something to be said for it. Neither is one quite convinced from this account that Hunter was really the leader of the Regulators. That he was one of the three or four chiefs is, however, evident. Furthermore the history of the movement, as read in this pamphlet, is not so clear as it should be, and one finds it necessary to turn to the more thorough (and also more judicious) account by

Professor John S. Bassett. It is borne in mind that this address was delivered before an audience supposed to be already in possession of the main facts of the history, but there are still too many gaps, too much taken for granted. A still more objectionable feature is the want of logical developments. Not to speak of typographical errors, there are numerous inaccuracies in the quotations, and several important quotations are not referred to their sources.

The Rise and Growth of American Politics, by Henry Jones Ford, (Macmillan, pp. viii, 409.) The purpose of this interesting and suggestive essay is "to tell the story of our politics so as to explain their nature and interpret their characteristics." It is not a narrative of events, but an attempt to explain causes in such a way that "the reader will understand the actual system of government under which we live."

The essay opens with a discussion of the origin of American politics. Holding that our politics are "an off-shoot from English politics," the author accounts for some supposed American characteristics on the ground that they are variations from methods that "died out in England but survived in the new world." After defining the political ideas of the authors of the Revolution and describing the conservative reaction that resulted in the adoption of the Constitution, Part I. concludes with a chapter showing the extent to which class rule prevailed during the early years of the Republic. Part II., sketching the political history down to the present time, shows the evolution of parties and how the extension of the suffrage undermined, and in the election of Jackson overthrew, the supremacy of the classes and converted the presidency into a representative institution. When the convention system made the electoral college a party agent the "constitutional design for the election of President" was completely effaced, and the office became an "instrument of popular control over the administration of public affairs."

Part III. is devoted to the organs of government. Here, too, because it is through party that the will of the nation is executed, party organization, subsistence and efficiency are considered. The author points out that in the period ending with the coming of Jackson the growth of parliamentary control was so great as to imperil the original conception of presidential duty. But when the presidential office came to have a direct representative character, as it has had since Jackson's time, its powers were so invigorated as to make executive policy decisive in political issues. Indeed, presidential authority has become so great that the author thinks "the American democracy has revived the oldest political institution of the race, the elective kingship."

The essay concludes with a discussion of the tendencies and the prospects of American politics. It is the author's belief that the further extension of executive authority is the only practical method of advancing popular rule. He finds that the democracy is perfecting as the ultimate type "the principle of the elective kingship as represented by the masterful Mayor, Governor, or President."

Mr. Ford has performed his task carefully and intelligently. His study has been thorough, and his treatment philosophic. His essay is a valuable contribution to the literature of the subject of which it treats.

JOHN WILLIAM PERRIN.

The files of newspapers possessed by the State Historical Society of Wisconsin number about ten thousand bound volumes. The Society's *Annotated Catalogue of Newspaper Files* (Madison, pp. 375), prepared by Miss Emma H. Blair under the direction of the Secretary, Mr. R. G. Thwaites, and the Librarian, Mr. I. S. Bradley, has therefore presented a difficult task, the performance of which has naturally been subject to delays. Its completion is a matter on which the Society is heartily to be congratulated, and not the Society only, but many historical students whose work calls them to extensive use of newspapers as material; for the collection is far from being purely local. Indeed a little more than half the pages of the catalogue are devoted to newspapers printed elsewhere than in Wisconsin. The richness of the collection in this respect is really astonishing, especially when one considers the youth of the Society and the present difficulty of making such acquisitions in the old states. Much English and Continental matter is also included. The plan of the catalogue is first to present lists arranged in alphabetical order of states and towns, then a chronological list from *Mercurius Aulicus* and *A Perfect Diurnall* down. The first, or geographical list goes into details as to the dates possessed, and is enriched with many valuable notes as to the history of the various papers. There is a full index of names, so that all this minute historical information is made perfectly accessible. The number of rarities in the collection is so considerable that the catalogue is in itself an interesting thing to dip into.

NOTES AND NEWS

Dr. Robert Fruin, the *doyen* of Dutch historical professors, died at Leyden on January 29 (or 30), aged seventy-five. From 1860 until his retirement, a few years ago, he was professor of Dutch history at Leyden. Though he published no great work after the issue of his important *Tien Jaren uit den Tachtigjarigen Oorlog*, in 1859, he wrote a large number of important monographs, was the teacher of many if not most of the Dutch historians of the present time, and won unmeasured influence by his learning, wisdom and fairness.

Professor Alphons Huber of the University of Vienna, author of a highly valued but now unfinished history of Austria in five volumes, and of several studies in medieval numismatics, died in Vienna on November 23, aged 64.

Dr. Gustav Gilbert, professor in the gymnasium at Gotha and author of the well-known *Handbuch der griechischen Staatsalterthümer*, died on December 24.

Mr. Edward G. Mason, formerly president of the Chicago Historical Society, died on December 18, at the age of 59. An eminent lawyer and a good citizen, his title to remembrance among historical students rests partly upon his active exertions in behalf of the society mentioned, especially in securing for it its present impressive building and a large portion of its valuable collections, and partly upon those minor writings for which alone his professional occupations left him leisure. The papers which he wrote were chiefly essays in the history of Illinois in the eighteenth century.

Lewis H. Boutell died at Washington, D. C., on January 16, 1899, at the age of seventy-two. He was a member of the American Historical Association, and was the author of the following historical studies: *Alexander Hamilton*, 1890; *Thomas Jefferson, The Man of Letters*, 1891; *Roger Sherman in the Federal Convention*, 1894; *The Life of Roger Sherman*, 1896. At the opening of the Civil War Mr. Boutell enlisted in a Massachusetts regiment, and he subsequently became major of the Forty-fifth Missouri Regiment. From the close of his military service until a few years before his death he was engaged in the practice of law in Chicago.

Colonel Thomas C. Donaldson, compiler of the familiar government book on *The Public Domain*, died in Philadelphia on November 18, at the age of 55.

We have also to note the death, at New York, on March 18, of Dr. Philip J. J. Valentini, the noted authority on Central American archaeology, who was born in Berlin in 1828.

It is understood that Mr. W. J. Stillman, who, as participant in European revolutions, as American diplomatic representative in the Papal States and in Crete, and as correspondent of the *Times* during the Russo-Turkish War and in subsequent years at Rome, has had most varied and interesting experiences, is preparing his autobiography.

Part XX. of the *Historical Atlas of Modern Europe* includes maps of Europe from 1814 to 1863, by Professor G. W. Prothero; of ecclesiastical France, by Mr. W. E. Rhodes; and of Western Asia under the Mongols, 1330, by Stanley Lane-Poole.

MM. Armand Colin and Co. of Paris announce the eleventh volume of Lavisse and Rambaud's *Histoire Générale*, entitled *Révolutions et Guerres Nationales*, and extending from 1848 to 1870.

A new historical journal, called *Historisches Literaturblatt*, has begun to appear fortnightly from the house of A. Hettler in Basel. It is to be devoted to comprehensive critical reviews of the recent books in special historical fields, to individual reviews, bibliography, reports of the contents of historical journals, etc. The first number contained a general review of the most recent investigations in Egyptian history, by A. Wiedemann.

The *Northwestern Monthly*, an educational journal published in Lincoln, Neb., contains in each issue certain series of documents in English for the study of European and American history. Those in European history (recently devoted to the history of Rome) are edited by Professor F. M. Fling, those in American history by Professor H. W. Caldwell. The European issues for the present year relate to a variety of topics in the history of medieval civilization, while those in the American series relate respectively to Gallatin, John Quincy Adams, Clay, Webster, Calhoun, Sumner, Douglas, Seward, Chase and Blaine.

The library of the University of Pennsylvania has been lately acquiring an unusually extensive set of British Parliamentary papers. The agents, Messrs. P. S. King and Co. of London, have printed an annotated catalogue of the earlier papers.

The *Revue de l' Université de Bruxelles* for October–December contains an article by Dr. Michel Huisman on the teaching of history in the historical seminaries of the University of Strassburg ("Chronique Strasbourgeoise") which old students at that place will be glad to see.

ANCIENT HISTORY.

The Egypt Exploration Fund has published an *Atlas of Ancient Egypt*, containing, besides eight maps in colors, a variety of geographical and historical notes, Biblical references, and a full index.

During the present winter the Egypt Exploration Fund has been conducting various explorations. Dr. Édouard Naville has been working at Deir el-Bahari, opposite Thebes. Professor Flinders Petrie has been exploring the pre-dynastic tombs found between Denderah and Hou, just below Koptos. Mr. N. de G. Davies has been laboring in the tomb of Ptah-hotep at Saqqarah, the tomb of a pyramid priest in the time of the fifth dynasty. For the Graeco-Roman branch of the work, Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt have been at work in the Fayum, where they have found a considerable number of papyri.

In the Semitic Texts and Translation Series (London, Luzac) Mr. L. W. King has published the first volume of a series of original Babylonian texts edited from tablets in the British Museum, entitled *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi, King of Babylon about B. C. 2200, Series of Letters of other Kings of the First Dynasty of Babylon.* This first volume contains Mr. King's introduction to the Babylonian texts. These will be accompanied with English translations, summaries and notes.

The Rev. C. H. W. Johns, in the first volume of his *Assyrian Deeds and Documents regarding the Transfer of Property,* presents over 700 documents, chiefly of the seventh century B. C., in lithograph. Less than one hundred documents of this kind had previously been published. Their historical value of course lies largely in the fact that they are absolutely contemporary with the events which they record and are free from all suspicion of bias. In a second volume Mr. Johns will present comments and explanations bearing upon various questions in the history of Assyrian civilization. A portion of the expense of publication has been borne by the Dukes of Devonshire and Portland.

Professor Hugo Winckler of Berlin, in the ninth *Heft* of his *Altorientalische Forschungen* (Leipzig, E. Pfeiffer) discourses of internal politics in the later Babylonian kingdom, of the time of the restoration of Judah, of the reforms of Nehemiah, and of Daniel and his friends.

In the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Prussian Academy, No. 36, Dr. Walther Judeich reports upon an archaeological mission in the northwest of Asia Minor which he undertook for the Academy in 1896. His journey was from Chanak-Kalessi to Pergamon and Broussa, and resulted in the identification of many ancient localities.

MM. Perrot and Chipiez have brought out the seventh volume (*La Grèce de l'Épopée, La Grèce Archaïque*) of their *Histoire de l'Art dans l'Antiquité* (Paris, Hachette).

Dr. Johannes Baunack has completed his collection of Delphic inscriptions, and with it the second volume of Dr. Hermann Collitz's *Sammlung der Griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, pp. 963).

In *Philologus,* LVII. 3, Dr. Edmund Lange completes his review of writings relating to Thucydides which have been published since 1890.

The March number of the *Revue Historique* contains a summary review of recent French books on Roman history, by M. Camille Jullian.

Professor Robinson Ellis's new edition of Velleius Paterculus (Oxford, University Press; New York, Henry Frowde) is a purely critical edition with preface, apparatus and commentary written in Latin. The text is based upon the Basel manuscript of Amerbach. Mr. Frowde also publishes Mr. St. George Stock's Clarendon Press edition of Caesar's Gallic War. Mr. Stock's text is that of Hoffman. His chief effort is to illustrate the historical matter of Caesar. The linguistic notes are not numerous, but there are long introductory chapters on the book, its author, the wars and provinces which it decribes, and the Roman army.

The *Roman History of Appian of Alexandria* has been translated from the Greek by Horace White, and published in two volumes by the Macmillan Company.

Under the title, *Roman Africa: Archaeological Walks in Algeria and Tunis*, Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons have published a translation, by Arabella Ward, of Gaston Boissier's well-known book.

Professor Otto Hirschfeld, of Berlin, has begun a new epigraphical enterprise, publishing the first *Lieferung* of a collection of *Inscriptiones trium Galliarum et duarum Germaniarum Latinae* (Berlin, G. Reimer).

For his inaugural lecture as professor of ancient history at Giessen Professor Ernst Kornemann chose the interesting subject of the transformation of the Gallic and Germanic communities of northern Italy and the transalpine regions into Roman *civitates*. The discourse as published, *Zur Stadtentstehung in den ehemals keltischen und germanischen Gebieten des Römerreichs* (Giessen, Münchow) extends to the close of the fourth century A.D., and will form a chapter of a more extensive work on Roman municipalities.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. Hopkins, *Land Tenure in Ancient India* (Political Science Quarterly, December); F. Spiegel, *Die alten Religionen in Êran* (Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, LII. 2); W. J. Woodhouse, *The Greeks at Plataiai* (Journal of Hellenic Studies, XVIII. 1); H. Lipsius, *Beiträge zur Geschichte griechischer Bundesverfassungen* (Berichte über die Verhandlungen der k. sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, L. 3); B. I. Wheeler, *Alexander's Conquest of Asia Minor* (Century, February); G. Colomb, *La Campagne de César contre Arioviste* (Revue Archéologique, July).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY.

The Church-Father Commission of the Berlin Academy have added to their series of *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller*, of which the first volume is reviewed elsewhere in these pages, two volumes of Origen, containing the *De Martyrio* and *Contra Celsum*. In their *Texte und Untersuchungen* (Leipzig, Hinrichs) they have recently brought out the Apocalypse of Elias and fragments of the Apocalypse of Sophonias, Coptic texts with translations; a series of liturgical fragments of the Egyptian church; a letter of Bishop Serapion of Thmuis; and a dissertation by Professor Jeep on the text of Philostorgios.

Bishop Coxe's American edition of the *Anti-Nicene Fathers* has been acquired by Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons, who offer it at a reduced price, and appear to make it the corner-stone of their so-called Christian Literature Club. Besides the eight volumes of the Edinburgh edition, the American edition will contain two more. The ninth, edited by Professor Allan Menzies of St. Andrews, will contain the Gospel of Peter, the Apocalypse of Peter, the Visio Pauli, the Apocalypse of the Virgin and Sedrach, the Testament of Abraham, the Acts of Xantippe and Polyxena, the Narrative of Zosimus, the Diatessaron of Tatian, the Apology of Aristides, a complete text of the Epistles of Clement, and Origen's commentaries on Matthew and John. The tenth volume is to contain a "bibliographical synopsis" by Dr. E. C. Richardson, librarian of Princeton University, and a general index, which, somewhat strangely, is announced to include only Volumes I. to VIII.

Dom Cuthbert Butler casts much new light on the problems relating to the sources for the early history of monachism by his edition of *The Lausiac History of Palladius* ("Texts and Studies," VI. 1, Cambridge, 1898, pp. xiv, 297), of which the text and a large part of the prolegomena are now published. The editor has a new view of the relations between the *Historia Lausiaca* and the *Historia Monachorum* and believes the Greek text of the latter to be its original.

Messrs. Little, Brown and Company have ready the fifth volume of Harnack's *History of Dogma*, dealing chiefly with Augustine and his teaching. There are two more volumes yet to come.

In the *Revue de l'Orient Latin*, V. 3 and 4, Dr. Chr. Kohler presents an "Index Rerum et Personarum quae in *Actis Sanctorum* Bollandistis et *Analectis Bollandianis* obviae ad Orientem Latinum spectant."

MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

The Vienna Academy have issued, as a volume of their *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (Vienna, F. Tempsky, pp. 480), a collection of *Itinera Hierosolymitana Saeculi IIII.-VIII.*, edited by Dr. Paul Geyer. A record of a much later pilgrimage, to Jerusalem and Sinai, made in the fifteenth century by the Zürich monk Felix Schmid, is given in No. 62 (1899) of the *Neujahrsblatt des Waisenhauses in Zürich* (Z., Fäsi and Beer, pp. 62).

The chief article in the *Neues Archiv*, XXIV. 1, consists of contributions by Dr. K. Zeumer to the study of Visigothic documents and Visigothic legislation, especially the second book of the Lex Visigothorum. P. Scheffer-Boichorst publishes some sixty new documents of the Hohenstaufen period, relating to Italy and Burgundy.

Professor Theodor Mommsen has brought out a new edition of the life of St. Severinus by Eugippius, *Eugippii Vita Severini* ("Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in usum Scholarum," Berlin, Weidmann, 1898, pp. xxxii, 60), being satisfied neither with that given by H. Sauppe in the *Monumenta*, in 1877, nor with that given by P. Knoell in the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*, in 1886. In *Hermes*, Vol. XXXII. (1897) he set forth his reasons for siding with Sauppe in preferring the Campanian class of manuscripts; in the same journal, XXXIII., he has printed further "Eugippiana."

M. Gabriel Monod publishes, as No. 119 in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études* (Paris, Bouillon, pp. 174) the first part, extending to 829, of his long-expected *Études Critiques sur les Sources de l'Histoire Carolingienne.*

Dr. Paul Geyer, of the gymnasium of Erlangen, intends to bring out a new edition of Adamnan *De Locis Sanctis*, concerning the text of which he has published two dissertations in the programme of the gymnasium.

The Bollandist fathers have begun the publication of a *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina Antiquae et Mediae Aetatis*, composed upon the plan of their *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca*, and intended to contain mention of all the hagiographical texts (lives, passions, narratives of translations and of miracles) written in Latin before the beginning of the sixteenth century. The first fasciculus (Brussels, pp. 224) extends from Abbanus to Caecilia.

Dr. Reinhold Röhricht, whose book on the kingdom of Jerusalem, the last of a long series of publications on the history of the Crusades, was recently mentioned in these pages, has published through Wagner of Innsbruck a *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge im Umriss* (pp. 273).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. Levison, *Zur Geschichte des Frankenkönigs Chlodovech* (Bonner Jahrbücher, 103); G. van Vloten, *Zur Abbasiden-Geschichte* (Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, LII. 2); H. Hubert, *Étude sur la Formation des États de l'Église* (Revue Historique, January, March); W. Sickel, *Das byzantinische Krönungsrecht bis zum 10. Jahrhundert* (Byzantinische Zeitschrift, VII. 3, 4); F. Schupfer, *La Scuola di Roma e la Questione Irneriana* (Memorie della Reale Accademia dei Lincei, 5, V. 1).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY.

The sixth volume of the *Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History* opens with a collection of extracts, chiefly political in their nature, from the French philosophers of the eighteenth century, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, D'Alembert, Holbach, Turgot, Sieyès. The collection is edited by Dr. Merrick Whitcomb. Other issues in the same volume are to be the X. Y. Z. Letters, edited by Professors McMaster and Ames; a series of extracts on the early Germans, edited by Dr. A. C. Howland; extracts from the *Notitia Dignitatum*, edited by Dr. William Fairley; and a portion of the laws of Charlemagne, edited by Professor D. C. Munro. Dr. Whitcomb's *Literary Source-Book of the Italian Renaissance* is to be followed by a *Literary Source-Book of the German Renaissanee.*

M. Hermann Muller's *Les Origines de la Compagnie de Jésus : Ignace et Lainez* (Paris, Fischbacher, pp. 329) is mainly devoted to a critical examination of the question how far the principles and constitution of the Society originated with Loyola, and how far they were elaborated by Lainez and other successors. The author also develops a striking amount of resemblance between the plan of the Society and that of certain Mohammedan religious organizations previously existing in the North of Africa.

Father Otto Braunsberger, S. J., has followed up his first volume of *Beati Petri Canisii Societatis Iesu Epistulae et Acta* with a second of equally admirable workmanship, extending from 1556 to 1560, and containing some six hundred pieces hitherto unprinted (Freiburg i. B., Herder, pp. lxi, 950).

Sir Harry H. Johnston, late administrator of British Central Africa, has contributed to the Cambridge Historical Series (Cambridge University Press) a short *History of the Colonization of Africa by Alien Races.*

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. de Vernouillet, *Rhodes et le Siège de 1522* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XII. 3); F. Roth, *Der Einfluss des Humanismus und der Reformation auf das gleichzeitige Erziehungs- und Schulwesen* (Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte, 60); P. de la Gorce, *Les Duchés de l'Elbe, l'Allemagne et l'Europe*, 1866, 1867 (Le Correspondant, December 25, January 10, 25); Comte Fleury, *La France et la Russie en 1870*, I. (Revue de Paris, December, 15).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

The index to parts III. and IV. of the catalogue of Rawlinson's miscellaneous manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, prepared by the Rev. W. D. Macray, the editor of the catalogue, is to be issued from the Clarendon Press. It is a minute index, not only to the text of the catalogue, but also to the general contents of the manuscripts.

We have heretofore called attention to Mr. W. Dawson Johnston's annotated catalogue cards for books on English history. The publishing section of the American Library Association has adopted them, has issued a small number of cards for 1897, and is proceeding to put forth in quarterly installments some fifty or sixty cards for the books of 1898. Beside the usual bibliographical information, annotations are added describing the books and naming or summarizing the most important reviews of them. The section is prepared also to furnish these annotated titles in pamphlet form.

Mr. W. H. Stevenson has in the press the Sandars Lectures of 1898, a volume bearing the title of *The Anglo-Saxon Chancery; a History of the Charters of the Old English Kings* (Cambridge University Press).

The promoters of the Alfred Memorial have agreed upon the publication of a book, which will be entitled *Alfred the Great.* It will be edited by Mr. Alfred Bowker, ex-mayor of Winchester, and will contain chapters on the Saxon Laws, by Sir Frederick Pollock; on Alfred as King, by Mr. Frederic Harrison; on Alfred as Educationist, by the Bishop of Bristol; on Alfred as Captain, by Professor Oman; on Alfred as Writer, by the Rev. Professor Earle; on Alfred as Geographer, by Sir Clements Markham; and on Saxon Art, by the Rev. W. J. Loftie.

Miss E. M. Leonard, formerly a student of Girton College, is preparing for publication by the Cambridge University Press a volume on *The Early History of English Poor Relief.*

The corporation of Leicester has now published the series of extracts from its early archives (1100–1327) to which we have heretofore referred in these pages. The volume, entitled *Records of the Borough of Leicester*, comprises about 600 pages. It has been carefully edited by Miss Mary Bateson, associate and lecturer of Newnham College, with revision by Mr. W. H. Stevenson and Canon Stocks and a preface by the Bishop of London. The charters and extracts, in Latin or Old French, are accompanied by translations. The records are of great importance to English municipal history; they are drawn from the rolls of the merchant gild, from the mayors' accounts, from the records of the Portmanmoot, from the tallage rolls and those of the coroners. Charters and official lists, facsimiles and indices are also included. The volume is published by the Cambridge University Press.

The Oxford University Press (Henry Frowde, 91 Fifth Avenue, New York) issues in small quarto the *Records of Merton Priory in the County of Surrey*, derived chiefly from early and unpublished documents by Major Alfred Heales, F. S. A., with collotype and other illustrations.

The Chetham Society has brought out (1897, 1898) as Vols. 38 and 39 of its publications the *Chartulary of Cockersand Abbey* in Lancashire, useful to English economic history and especially to the history of agriculture.

The Société de l'École des Chartes has published an interesting and important volume of reports and documents on the popular rising under Richard II., edited by Professor André Réville and M. Charles Petit-Dutaillis. The volume is entitled *Le Soulèvement des Travailleurs d'Angleterre en 1381* (Paris, Picard).

Vol. XII. of the publications of the Selden Society is composed of *Select Cases in the Court of Requests*, 1497–1569 (pp. 257), edited by Mr. I. S. Leadam. The texts are English and Latin.

Father Gasquet has brought out (London, John Nimmo) a new edition of his well-known *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries*, revised in the light of the new information brought out during the last ten years by Mr. Gairdner's *Calendar of State Papers* and by other books.

Under the title *The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion* (Clarendon Press), Mr. Henry Gee has published a minute and careful study of ecclesiastical history between 1558 and 1564, with special reference to the number of deprivations then carried into effect. Mr. Gee's researches, far closer than those of his predecessors, indicate about two hundred of such in a body of nearly ten thousand clergy.

The Scottish History Society is about to publish a series of documents and papers from the Vatican Archives relating to the papal embassies to Mary Queen of Scots and her mother the Regent. They have been selected for the Society by the Rev. J. Hungerford Pollen, S. J., and include documents relating to the mission of Nicolas de Pelevé, bishop of Amiens, legate to the Queen Regent, and to the negotiations of Nicolas de Gouda and Vincent Laureo, papal envoys to Queen Mary, in 1561–1562 and in 1566–1567. This will be practically the first publication of material from the Vatican Archives relating to the history of Scotland. During the present year the Society expects to bring out a first volume of *Documents Relating to the History of the Scots Brigade in the Netherlands*, edited by Mr. James Ferguson, and a volume on *Scotland and the Protectorate*, by Mr. C. H. Firth. The papers on the Scots Brigade consist of extracts from the resolutions of the States-General and of the Council of State and from their diplomatic and military correspondence. The first volume will extend to the Revolution of 1688, when the brigade passed for about ten years into the direct service of Great Britain. The second extends from the return of the brigade until it was merged in the Dutch army in 1783. It is intended to issue a third volume of papers originally belonging to the individual regiments and now preserved in the municipal archives of Rotterdam.

The Huguenot Society of London has arranged to issue, as an extra volume, a monograph on the Dutch Church at Colchester and its registers, by Mr. W. J. C. Moens, the chief authority on the Dutch churches in England. The refugee settlement at Colchester was a specially large and important one, famous for its manufacture of bays and says, and much fresh information on its history has been obtained by Mr. Moens. The volume can be subscribed for through him (Tweed, Lymington, Hants) or any fellow of the Society.

Messrs. Methuen and Co. have in hand an elaborate edition of Hobbes's *Leviathan*, to be edited by Mr. W. G. Pogson-Smith, of St. John's College, Oxford.

Messrs. Henry Young and Sons of Liverpool announce for early publication a work on *Liverpool in the Time of Charles II.*, which Sir Edward Moore, Bart., of Bank Hall, Liverpool, wrote in 1667–1668 for the guidance and instruction of his son and heir. The work, though once privately printed, has never been published for sale before. It will be edited by Mr. William Fergusson Irvine.

Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co. have ready the fourth volume of the *Memoirs of the Verney Family*, bringing the family history down from the Restoration to the death of Sir Ralph Verney in 1696.

The third volume of Mr. Laird Clowes's *History of the Royal Navy* relates to the period from 1714 to 1793. Mr. Clowes himself writes the civil history of the navy during that period and the history of the greater naval operations from 1714 to 1762, while Captain Mahan presents a brilliant narrative of the major operations from 1763 to 1792. Sir Clements Markham contributes a brief chapter on the voyages and discoveries. The minor operations of the earlier period are described by Mr. L. Carr Laughton. Those of the second period will be described by Mr. H. W. Wilson in the fourth volume. The latter is expected to be published this spring, and will contain a chapter on the naval war of 1812 by Governor Roosevelt.

It is understood that Sir William Harcourt, obtaining leisure by the resignation of Liberal leadership, will devote a part of it to a biography of Bolingbroke.

Mr. W. K. Dickson has edited for Messrs. W. and A. K. Johnston of Edinburgh a third edition of Johnston and Robertson's *Historical Geography of the Clans of Scotland*, first published in 1872. Mr. Dickson has added a narrative of the Highland campaigns, General Wade's report of 1724 and a portion of a "Memorial anent the True State of the Highlands" attributed to Lord President Forbes, and has carefully revised both maps and text.

The collection of papers and manuscripts heretofore preserved by the Earl of Hardwicke at Wimpole Hall, a collection rich in documents relating to the political affairs of Great Britain during the eighteenth century, was sold by auction in London on February 22–25.

The *Forty-fourth Annual Report of the Postmaster-General* contains in an appendix a history of the delivery of letters in rural districts from the beginning of the system in 1764 to the present time.

It is likely that Sir Herbert Maxwell's exhaustive life of the Duke of Wellington will not be published until the autumn.

M. Eugène d'Eichthal has published in French (Paris, Alcan) *La Correspondance inédite de Stuart Mill avec Gustave d'Eichthal*, interesting on the one side as showing a part of the development of Mill's political thought, and on the other for the history of St. Simonism. Mill's correspondence with Comte has also been recently published by the same house.

The State Trials Committee have published an eighth volume of their new series, edited by Mr. J. E. P. Wallis, and extending from 1850 to 1858. The volume contains reports of the trial of Simon Bernard for participation in the Orsini plot; of Lieutenant Pate for assault upon the Queen; of the Wensleydale life-peerage claim, and other cases of constitutional intesest.

Colonel Edward Vibart, late of the Fifteenth Bengal Cavalry, probably the last survivor of those British officers who were in the garrison at Delhi when the Indian Mutiny broke out, has published a thrilling narrative of his escape and other adventures in the campaign under the title of *The Sepoy Mutiny as Seen by a Subaltern, from Delhi to Lucknow* (London: Smith, Elder and Co.). The volume is supplemented by two chapters by Mr. P. V. Luke and Colonel A. R. D. Mackenzie, the former relating to the telegraph operator's celebrated despatch and the other giving a personal account of the outbreak at Meerut.

The Macmillan Co. are about to publish the *Life of Admiral of the Fleet Sir Henry Keppel*, with illustrations by the late Sir Oswald Brierly.

Messrs. Chatto and Windus will publish, this spring, *The Romance of a Pro-Consul, being the Personal Life and Memories of the Right Hon. Sir George Grey, K.C.B.* The author is Mr. James Milne, who was on terms of intimate friendship with Sir George Grey.

The *Life and Letters of Archbishop Benson* will be published this spring by the Macmillan Company. The volume is edited by Dr. Benson's son and will contain portraits and illustrations.

The Macmillan Company are publishing a book called *The Welsh People; their Origin, Language and History.* For this volume the interesting matter contained in the report of the Royal Commission on Land in Wales and Monmouthshire has been edited, with additions, notes and appendices, by Professor John Rhys and Mr. David Brynmor Jones, Q.C., M.P. The book presents a thorough study of the Welsh race, laws and language and of the constitutional relations of Wales to England. The appendix contains an exhaustive bibliography.

Mr. Michael MacDonagh is preparing what is intended to be an exhaustive and critical life of Daniel O'Connell. In writing the life of Bishop Doyle Mr. MacDonagh came upon much new and important information respecting O'Connell's career as an agitator, and he expects to make much use of unpublished letters and documents relating to the subsequent portions of his career.

Early this year Messrs. Blackwood expect to publish a *History of the Border Counties* by Sir George Douglas, in which the author has aimed to bring the history of these counties into line with the results of recent research.

A brief bibliography of Delagoa Bay will be found in the issue of *Literature* for November 16.

The indefatigable Sir William Hunter has published through Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co. the first volume of a new *History of British India*, bringing his story down to the overthrow of the English in the Spice Archipelago in 1623.

Messrs. Frederik Muller and Co. of Amsterdam have at length published their photo-lithographic reproduction of Tasman's *Journal* of his discovery of Van Diemens Land and New Zealand in 1642, with documents relating to his exploration of Australia in 1644. Besides the fac-simile of the manuscript journal and of the fifty-three colored drawings and charts which accompany it, the volume contains an English translation, Professor J. E. Heeres's account of the life and labors of Tasman, original documents, etc.

Under the title, somewhat unfortunate and concealing, as it seems to us, of *The Long White Cloud—Ao-tea-roa*, Mr. William P. Reeves, Agent-General of New Zealand in London, has published (London, Marshall, pp. 430) an important and valuable work on the history of that colony.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. B. Paley, *The Roman Roads of Britain* (Nineteenth Century, November); W. H. Stevenson, *The Beginnings of Wessex* (English Historical Review, January); *St. Thomas of Canterbury* (Church Quarterly Review, January); G. Neilson, *Tenure by Knight-Service in Scotland* (Juridical Review, January); J. R. Tanner, *The Navy from the Restoration to the Revolution* (English Historical Review, January); G. Toudouze, *La Bataille de la Hougue, 1692* (Revue Maritime, October, November); *Admiral Duncan* (Quarterly Review, January); P. Thureau-Dangin, *La Renaissance Catholique en Angleterre au XIX^e Siècle* (Le Correspondant, October 25, November 10); J. Bryce, *British Experience in the Government of Colonies* (Century, March).

FRANCE.

The house of Felix Alcan has in press the eigth volume of the *Inventaire Analytique des Archives du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères*, containing the political correspondence of Guillaume Pellicier, French ambassador in Venice, 1540–1542, edited by M. Alexandre Tausserat-Radel; the second and third (concluding) volumes for Spain, by M. Morel-Fatio and Léonardon, in the *Recueil des Instructions données aux Ambassadeurs et Ministres de France;* and two volumes in the same series, for Savoy or Sardinia and Mantua, edited by M. Horric de Beaucaire. M. Alcan also expects shortly to issue the third and last volume of M. Eugène Plantet's official *Correspondance des Beys de Tunis et des Consuls de France avec la Cour*, 1577–1830.

The Société de l'Histoire de France, at the instance of Count Horric de Beaucaire, and with friendly aid from the departments of foreign affairs and instruction (MM. Hanotaux and Rambaud) has undertaken a new critical edition of the *Mémoires* of Richelieu. This great task, filling perhaps fifteen volumes, will extend over ten or a dozen years. The first two volumes are expected to appear before the end of the present year. The society also expects to bring out this year a new edition of the memoirs of the Huguenot Duke of Bouillon, 1555–1586, accompanied by many unprinted letters of Henry IV. and others to the duke. This will be edited by the newly-elected president of the society, Count Baguenault de Puchesse.

M. Albert Sorel's *Nouveaux Essais d'Histoire et de Critique* (Paris, Plon) include essays on Taine, Richelieu, Frederick II., the trial of Marshal Ney, and a series of *Vues sur l'Histoire* which present the author's philosophy of the art of historical writing.

A book expected to take the highest rank is M. Charles de la Roncière's *Histoire de la Marine Française*, of which the first volume, extending from the earliest times to the treaty of Brétigny, has just appeared (Paris, Plon, pp. 532).

In the December issue of the *Comptes-rendus* of the Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques M. E. Levasseur begins a series of papers on the sources for the history of the working classes and of industry in France, presenting at the same time a bibliography of the subject for the Gallo-Roman period.

The Viscount d'Avenel has published the third and fourth volumes of his important *Histoire Économique de la Propriété, des Salaires, des Denrées et de tous les Prix en général depuis l'an 1200 jusqu'à l'an 1800.*

Abbé Em. Briant's *Histoire de Sainte Radegonde, Reine de France, et des Sanctuaires et Pèlerinages en son Honneur* (Paris, Oudin, pp. 536), a work marked by high scholarship though also by some credulity, has been printed magnificently and adorned with many interesting phototypes, chromolithographs and engravings.

A valuable contribution to the history both of France and of Italy in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is R. Holtzmann's *Wilhelm von Nogaret, Rat und Grosssiegelbewahrer Philipps des Schönen von Frankreich* (Freiburg i. B., Mohr, pp. 279).

M. Georges Daumet publishes, as No. 118 of the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études* (Paris, Bouillon, pp. 273), an important *Étude sur l'Alliance de la France et de la Castille au XIV^e^ et au XV^e^ Siècle*, an alliance which endured almost without interruption from 1312 to 1474.

M. Paul Bonnefon's *Montaigne et ses Amis* (Paris, Armand Colin, two vols.) is an elaborate work, the result of extensive and learned researches, which casts much light on Montaigne's surroundings and thus on his life and thoughts.

M. Alfred Galland, professor in the Lycée de Laval, in his *Essai sur l'Histoire du Protestantisme à Caen et en Basse-Normandie, de l'Édit de Nantes à la Révolution* (Paris, Grassart, pp. 550); besides narrating the events in the history of Protestantism under the Edict and in the development of the persecution and the final emancipation, makes a solid and interesting contribution to the knowledge of Huguenot life and manners, intellectual and industrial activity in Normandy during two centuries.

M. Fortunat Strowski, in his *Saint François de Sales: Introduction à l'Histoire du Sentiment Religieux en France au XVII^e^ Siècle* (Paris, Plon, pp. 424) presents not only a biography, but a penetrating and scientific study of the inner history of Catholicism in France after the period of the Counter-reformation, and of the transition from that mere attachment to the Church as the symbol of order which, according to him, was the prevalent attitude at the beginning of the century, to a period marked in a high degree by piety and mysticism.

M. Alfred des Cilleuls, in his *Histoire et Régime de la Grande Industrie en France aux XVII^e et XVIII^e Siècles* (Paris, Giard et Brière, pp. 406) endeavors, upon the basis furnished by minute studies of the journals and documents of the Conseil du Commerce, to answer the question, to what extent industrial freedom progressed in France after Colbert's time, and how largely enfranchisement was the work of the Revolution.

Count d'Haussonville's first volume on *La Duchesse de Bourgogne et l'Alliance Savoyarde sous Louis XIV.* (Paris, Calmann Lévy, pp. 502), a volume which unites studies of diplomatic history, of the court, and of personal biography of the duchess and her husband, brings his narrative down to the date of their marriage.

M. Marcel Marion, professor in the Faculty of Letters of Bordeaux, has subjected to exhaustive study the relations of the Duke of Aiguillon to the Parliament and magistrates of Brittany, an episode in the history of the struggle between absolute monarchy and the local magistracies. His book, *La Bretagne et le Duc d'Aiguillon, 1753–1770* (Paris, A. Fontemoing, pp. 624), sums up decidedly for the royal governor, and lays the blame for the conflicts on the magistrates.

M. Pierre Boye's *Stanislas Leczinski et le Troisième Traité de Vienne* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, pp. 588), a thesis presented to the Faculty of Letters of Nancy, rests on thorough studies in the archives of France, Germany, Austria and Poland, and presents a less favorable view of Stanislas as duke of Lorraine than has hitherto been usual.

The "Librairie Historique de la Révolution et de l'Empire" has published at Paris the first volume (A to F) of a solid book of reference entitled *Dictionnaire Historique et Biographique de la Révolution et de l'Empire.* The work is edited in respect to general history by Dr. Robinet, in respect to the descriptive and biographical portions by M. Adolphe Robert, in respect to constitutional and legislative history by M. Le Chaplain.

The Société de l'Histoire de la Révolution has published *Les Sections de Paris de 1790 à l'An IV.* (pp. 320), by Mr. Ernest Mellié, in which the activities of those bodies are studied with great precision, although, it must be added, with strongly radical prepossessions.

Professor Aulard intends soon to publish in book form, under the title *L'Histoire Politique de la Révolution*, a series of articles which he has lately been contributing to *La Révolution Française*, several of which have heretofore been mentioned in these pages. The influence of the American Revolution and of American state constitutions upon the development of political ideas in France will be treated.

M. Charles-Louis Chassin has completed his documentary history of *Les Pacifications de l'Ouest* (Paris, Dupont, T. II., 636 pp., T. III., 803 pp.). His second volume recounts the events of Hoche's dictatorship and proceeds to the failure of the Irish expedition in December, 1796. The third carries on the study of the Vendée and of the Chouans from the 18th Fructidor to the Concordat, with a supplementary chapter on the plots of the Royalists under the Empire and their action in 1814 and 1815.

The *Collection de Documents relatifs à l'Histoire de Paris pendant la Révolution* has been enriched by the addition of a volume made up by M. Aulard, chiefly out of the newspapers and the reports of the police, presenting varied materials for the period from July 26, 1794, to June 9, 1795, and entitled *Paris pendant la Réaction thermidorienne et sous le Directoire* (Paris, Cerf).

Vol. V. of Baron A. Lumbroso's *Miscellanea Napoleonica* (Rome, Modes and Mendel) contains an important collection of documents relating to Murat, several letters of Josephine and of Napoleon to Barras, nineteen letters from Hinterleutner, Prussian *chargé d'affaires* in Sardinia, to Count Balbo, etc. In the *Revue de Paris* for October 15, 1898, Lumbroso prints a series of letters of Murat hitherto unprinted, of the years 1813–1815, extracted from his forthcoming edition of Murat's correspondence. Episodes of Murat's career are also studied by W. F. Lord ("Murat and Bentinck") in the October number of the *Nineteenth Century*, and by A. Dufourcq ("Murat et la Question de l'Unité Italienne en 1815") in the *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire* for last April–June.

The Academy of the Moral and Political Sciences has proposed as a prize subject for 1901 the history from 1800 to 1810 of some one of the departments in Alsace, Lorraine, Champagne, Picardy or Flanders.

It is reported that the ex-Empress Eugénie is engaged in writing her memoirs, which are nearly completed and will shortly appear. It is said that one entire volume of the work will be devoted to the preparations for the Franco-German War, the responsibility for which the Empress lays upon the Duc de Grammont, Benedetti and Ollivier.

The Duc de Morny, possessing the papers of his father, the half-brother and confidant of Napoleon III., is engaged in compiling from them a biographical memoir of the first duke.

Lt.-Col. Rousset has published (Paris, Librairie Illustrée) an octavo atlas of 56 maps intended to accompany his six-volume *Histoire Générale de la Guerre Franco-Allemande*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. Eichner, *Agobard, Erzbischof von Lyon* (Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie, XLI. 4); A. Luchaire, *L'Université de Paris sous Philippe-Auguste* (Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, January); G. Hanotaux, *Richelieu à Avignon* (Revue des Deux Mondes, January 1); T.

Kükelhaus, *Zur Geschichte Richelieu's; Unbekannte Papiere Fancans* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, II. 1); A. Mathiez, *Étude Critique sur les Journées des 5 et 6 Octobre 1789,* III. (Revue Historique, January); F. A. Aulard, *La Formation du Parti Républicain, 1790–1791* (La Révolution Française, October 14); id., *La Fuite à Varennes et le Mouvement Républicain* (ibid., November 14); id., *Les Républicains et les Démocrates, depuis le Massacre du Champ de Mars jusqu'à la Journée du 20 Juin 1792* (ibid., December 14); id., *Le Détrônement de Louis XVI.* (ibid., January 14); H. Glagau, *General Lafayette und der Sturz der Monarchie in Frankreich* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXII. 2); A. Becker, *Plan der zweiten Heirat Napoleon's* (Mittheilungen des Instituts für oesterreichische Geschichtsforschung, XIX. 1); G. Rothan, *Napoléon III. et l'Italie,* I. (Revue des Deux Mondes, February 1); M. de Marcère, *La Constitution de 1875 et M. Wallon* (Revue de Paris, February 15).

ITALY, SPAIN, PORTUGAL.

In the *Archivio Storico Italiano,* 1898, 3, M. Léon G. Pélissier gives an account of the French books on Italian history which appeared in 1897.

The sixth volume of Signor A. Manno's monumental *Bibliografia degli Stati della Monarchia di Savoia* (Turin, Fratelli Bocca, pp. 552) is entirely devoted to Genoa. It embraces over seven thousand items, referring to manuscripts as well as to printed books.

The letters of Michelangelo derived from the Buonarroti Archives in Florence, concerning which we have spoken heretofore in these pages, will appear in English translation as well as in Italian and French before the end of the present year. The English translations are being made by Miss Helen Zimmern, and will be published by Messrs. Harper and Brothers.

Signor Rosario Salvo, one of the few surviving members of the Sicilian Legion which went to fight in Lombardy in 1848, and who afterward took part in the defense of Messina against the Bourbon troops and was proscribed after the triumph of the reaction, has recounted in two interesting volumes his recollections of the Sicilian movements of that time, *Rivoluzioni Siciliane 1848–1860.*

Signor Crispi's *Memoirs* will be published simultaneously in English, French, German, Italian, and Russian, and will form twelve volumes each containing 500 pages. It is expected that some of them will cast much light upon the history of the Triple Alliance.

The last number received of the *Revista Crítica de Historia y Literatura,* a double number (for April and May) is entirely given up to an extensive article by Arturo Farinelli, of the University of Innsbruck, in critical review of R. Foulché-Delbosc's *Bibliographie des Voyages en Espagne et en Portugal.*

In a volume entitled *De Historia y Arte* Señor Don Rafael Altamira, of the University of Oviedo, has printed certain additions to his book on *La Enseñanza de la Historia* (noticed in this REVIEW, Vol. I., p. 316), an article on the archives, libraries and museums of Spain, another on North American books of travel in Spain, etc.

Of Dr. Franz Hümmerich's *Vasco da Gama und die Entdeckung des Seewegs nach Ostindien* (Munich, C. H. Beck, pp. 203) the first half is an excellent dissertation on the life of the navigator and on his two voyages, based on original and partly on new sources. The second half contains complete texts of all important passages in sources. For the second voyage the author is the first to use a letter in the Library of San Marco at Venice, sent home by an Italian companion of Vasco, Mateo de Begnino.

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND.

The sixth "Deutsche Historikertag" will be held at Halle a. S. at Easter, 1900.

In the great German historical series the following are to be chronicled as recently published: In the quarto edition of the *Monumenta*, the first part of the *Liber Pontificalis*, edited by Professor Mommsen, and the first part of Vol. V. (Carolingian) of the *Epistolae*; in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, a portion ("Instrumentum domesticum," pp. 491–996) of Vol. XV., Latin inscriptions of the city of Rome, ed. H. Dressler; in the *Publikationen aus den kön. preussischen Staatsarchiven*, Vols. LXXI., LXXII., LXXIII., containing the third and concluding portion of the political correspondence of Elector Albert Achilles, ed. F. Priebatsch, the correspondence (1731–1759) of Frederick the Great with Grumbkow and Maupertuis, ed. Reinhold Koser, and a portion of the *Hessisches Urkundenbuch*, namely a third volume (1360–1399) of the cartulary of the domains of the Teutonic Order in Hesse, ed. A. Wyss; in the *Fontes Rerum Austriacarum*, a fiftieth volume, *Acten und Correspondenzen zur Geschichte der Gegenreformation in Innerösterreich unter Erzherzog Karl II.* (1578–1590), ed. J. Loserth; of the *Deutsche Reichstagsakten unter Kaiser Sigmund*, the section relating to the years 1433 to 1435, ed. G. Beckmann; in the Heeren and Ukert series, the fourth volume (1508–1597) of Dr. Sigmund Riezler's *Geschichte Baierns* and a first volume, extending to the beginning of the fourteenth century, of a *Geschichte Belgiens* by M. Henri Pirenne. An index volume has been added to Dr. Moriz Brosch's *Geschichte Englands* in the series last mentioned.

The contest in Germany over Lamprecht's methods goes merrily on. In the *Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXXI. 2, as already mentioned in these pages, Herr von Below subjected them to severe criticism in an article entitled *Die Neue Historische Methode*. To this Dr. Lamprecht desired to make extended reply. Unable to secure from that journal as much space as he desired at any early date, he has printed a pamphlet of fifty pages, *Die Historische Methode des Herrn von Below*, which is sent out, under the cover, with each number of the *Historische Zeitschrift*, and may also be obtained of R. Gaertner, Berlin. Professor Lamprecht also has an article, *Ueber die Entwickelungsstufen der deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft*, in the *Zeitschrift für Kulturgeschichte*, V. 6, VI. 1, 2.

The publisher A. Hettler of Leipzig has issued an *Adressbuch der deutschen Historiker und Geschichtslehrer*, which may be of convenience to American students.

A new documentary series, extensive in plan, has been begun in Germany, with some support from the Prussian Academy. It is to be called *Denkmäler der deutschen Kulturgeschichte*; and is to be published by R. Gaertner of Berlin. Its plan is to give a more secure basis to the study of the history of civilization in Germany by publishing scholarly editions of documents carefully selected from among the masses of letters, diaries, journals of travellers, local ordinances, public and private account-books, etc., which have been preserved from the Middle Ages and from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The scheme is Germanically subdivided. The first series is to consist of letters. Of this the first division will comprise German private letters of the Middle Ages, edited by Dr. Georg Steinhausen, librarian of the University of Jena, and author of a recent work in two volumes entitled *Geschichte des deutschen Briefes*. Of this sub-section Vol. I., "Fürsten und Magnaten, Edle und Ritter," has now appeared (pp. xvi, 454).

The city of Mainz plans for June 24, 25, and 26, 1900, an impressive celebration of the five-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gutenberg. Beside formal addresses and festivities, the city intends to hold a typographical exhibition illustrating in all its details the historical development of the art of printing from the days of Gutenberg to our own time, with especial attention to the early years, and to publish a scientific work on Gutenberg by noted specialists. It also proposes to found at Mainz a Gutenberg museum, and to make a large permanent collection of incunabula and other works pertaining to the history of the art of printing.

Three interesting contributions *Zur Geschichte des Hexenprozesses* have been published as an "Ergänzungsheft" to the *Zeitschrift für Kulturgeschichte*: two sixteenth-century trials edited by Dr. A. Richel of the town library of Aix-la-Chapelle; a series of documents respecting sorcery and witchcraft in Pomerania by Dr. Stojentin of Stettin; and a paper respecting trials in Styria by Dr. Wilhelm Ruland of Munich.

The March number of the *Revue Historique* contains a summary review of recent German publications in the history of the Reformation, by Professor Alfred Stern of Zürich.

Archivrath Dr. Friedrich Philippi, state archivist of the province of Westphalia, has commemorated the two-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of the peace of Münster by publishing, with the aid of several other scholars, a memorial volume, *Der Westfälische Friede* (Münster, Regensberg, pp. 213) with illustrations after originals in the archives.

The section of the Prussian General Staff devoted to military history has in preparation an elaborate work on the history of the Seven Years' War. From among the preparatory labors for this work they have published (*Militärwochenblatt*, Beiheft 3) a critical monograph on the diaries and other materials contained among the manuscripts of the Süssenbach Collection.

Fritz Friedrich's *Politik Sachsens 1801–1803; Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Auflösung des Heiligen Römischen Reiches* (Leipzig, Duncker and Humblot, pp. 175), an issue in the series of *Leipziger Studien aus dem Gebiet der Geschichte*, traces with care and intelligence the relations of Saxony to the Empire and to Prussia during the years named, and the process by which the alliance with Prussia was dissolved without being replaced by one with Austria.

The latest issue in the *Historische Bibliothek* (Munich and Leipzig, R. Oldenbourg) is a volume on *Die Berliner Märztage von 1849; Die Ereignisse und ihre Überlieferung*, by Professor Wilhelm Busch of Tübingen (pp. 74). Without pretending to use unknown or manuscript materials, the author endeavors to furnish a general account of the whole episode in the light of all the printed sources, especially those brought out by the recent semi-centennial commemorations, and a critical examination of their value.

Dr. Hans Blum's *Fürst Bismarck und seine Zeit* is completed by the addition of a volume of appendix, 1895–1898, and index (Munich, Beck, pp. 261).

Readers of the reviews of Bismarck books on previous pages may be interested to know that a *Wegweiser durch Bismarck's "Gedanken und Erinnerungen"* has been published by Professor Horst Kohl through Messrs. G. J. Göschen of Leipzig.

The Historical Commission for the kingdom of Saxony held its third annual meeting on December 7. It was announced that the edition of the reports of Councillor Hans von der Planitz to Frederick the Wise, and the acts and letters of the Elector Maurice (ed. Brandenburg) were well advanced in the press. The history of the Saxon central administration has been confided to Dr. Treusch von Buttlar of Dresden. Plans were made for a history of the *geistig* life of Leipzig—church and school, literature, music and art—by various competent hands. An industrial, social and constitutional history of Leipzig is also contemplated.

The Verein für Geschichte Dresdens has issued an *Atlas zur Geschichte Dresdens*, edited by the president of the society, Dr. Otto Richter, municipal archivist and librarian, and containing more than fifty plans and views of the town or of parts of it. They range in date from 1521 to 1898, and are derived from a great variety of sources, in some cases rare.

A bibliography of the Emperor Francis Joseph, *àpropos* of his fiftieth anniversary, is printed in *Literature* for November 26.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. Sickel, *Die Kaiserkrönungen von Karl bis Berengar* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXII. 1); H. Otto, *Die Absetzung Adolfs von Nassau und die römische Curie* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, II. 1); E. Otto, *Alchimisten und Goldmacher an deutschen Fürstenhöfen* (Zeitschrift für Kulturgeschichte, VI. 1, 2); K. Häbler, *Die Stellung der Fugger zum Kirchenstreite des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, III. 4); P. Zinck, *Studentisches Leben in Leipzig zur Zeit des Kurfürsten August, 1553–1586* (Zeitschrift für Kulturgeschichte, VI. 3, 4); S. Riezler, *Die Meuterei Johann's von Werth 1647* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXII. 1, 2); A. de Ruville, *Der Ursprung des siebenjährigen Krieges* (Nord und Süd, October).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM.

A considerable section of Dutch historical bibliography is covered by the *Oranje-Nassau-Bibliotheek* (bibliography of books, pamphlets, etc., relating to princes and princesses of the house of Orange-Nassau, from the sixteenth century down), which has been published at the Hague by van Stockum (pp. 162).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE.

M. K. Waliszewski has followed up his remarkable studies of Peter the Great and of Catherine by a volume, conceived upon the same plan, upon a striking French character in Polish history, the wife of King John Sobieski, "Marysienka" in popular nomenclature, *Marysienka, Marie de la Grange d'Arquien, Reine de Pologne, Femme de Sobieski, 1641–1716* (Paris, Plon, pp. 383).

AMERICA.

Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons announce the publication of a new quarterly journal devoted to the interests of anthropology, especially anthropology in America. The periodical is to be entitled *The American Anthropologist* (*New Series*). It has been established under the auspices of the anthropological section of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Original papers, briefer contributions, reviews of books, a current bibliography of anthropology, and minor notes and news will be printed. The board of editors will comprise Dr. Frank Baker of the Smithsonian Institution, Dr. Franz Boas of the American Museum of Natural History, Dr. Daniel G. Brinton, Dr. George M. Dawson of the Geological Survey of Canada, Dr. George A. Dorsey of the Field Columbian Museum, Professor William H. Holmes of the United States National Museum, Major J. F. Powell of the Bureau of American Ethnology, and Professor Frederick W. Putnam of the Peabody Museum at Cambridge. The secretary of the board and managing editor of the periodical will be Mr. F. W. Hodge, whose address is 1333 F Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

The American Jewish Historical Association held its seventh annual meeting in Philadelphia on December 26. Dr. Cyrus Adler was elected president, and Dr. Herbert Friedenwald corresponding secretary. Mr. Simon W. Rosendale presented the report of the committee on Dutch records. Papers were read on the history of the Jews in Surinam by Professor Gottheil of Columbia; on Mexican Jewish history by the Rev. Dr. H. P. Mendes of New York; and on the Jews of Jamaica by Hon. Oscar S. Straus; as well as several relating to the history of the Jews in the United States.

The issue of the *Johns Hopkins University Studies* concluding the sixteenth series is entitled *Jared Sparks and Alexis de Tocqueville*, and presents correspondence between the two extending from 1831 to 1853, edited by Professor Herbert B. Adams. The largest and most interesting piece is a collection of "Observations on the Government of Towns in Massachusetts" which Sparks prepared for De Tocqueville's use. The seventeenth series, that for the year 1899, is intended to consist of monographs on the several subjects: History of State Banking in Maryland, by A. C. Bryan; History of the Know-Nothing Party in Maryland, by L. F. Schmeckebier; History of Slavery in North Carolina, by J. S. Bassett; History of Slavery in Virginia, by J. C. Ballagh; The Labadist Colony in Maryland, by B. B. James; The Separatists of Zoar, by George B. Landis; Early Development of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Project, by George W. Ward; The Admission of Iowa into the Union, by J. A. James; The Colonial Executive prior to the Restoration, by P. L. Kaye; The History of Suffrage in Virginia, by J. A. C. Chandler.

Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons announce a volume on the history of the territorial expansion of the United States by Mr. Charles Henry Butler. In their series of the Writings of the Fathers of the Republic, they announce the sixth and concluding volume of Dr. Charles R. King's *Writings of Rufus King*, the tenth and concluding volume of Mr. Paul L. Ford's *Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, the continuation of Mr. Hamilton's *Writings of James Monroe*, and an edition of the *Writings of James Madison*, edited by Mr. Gaillard Hunt of the Department of State.

To the *Old South Leaflets* two additions relating to Lafayette have been made, Nos. 97 and 98. The first is a series of extracts of the most interesting passages from Lafayette's autobiography; the second contains ten of his letters to Washington, and Washington's letter of December 25, 1798, to Lafayette.

Gustavus W. Schroeder, of Brooklyn, New York, is at once author and publisher of a volume entitled *History of the Swedish Baptists in Sweden and America*. The book gives an account of the work of the Baptists in Sweden during the last fifty years, and among the American Swedes.

Putnam's Historical Magazine for July and August contains a brief article on Scottish sources of information concerning American families originating in Scotland.

Dr. J. P. MacLean, librarian of the Western Reserve Historical Society of Cleveland, has recently completed the manuscript of an account of the doings of the Scotch Highlanders in America prior to the peace of 1783.

The library of the State of New York has issued the *Ninth Comparative Summary and Index* to the legislation of the states, covering the year 1898.

The Irish Washingtons, at Home and Abroad, by George Washington, of Dublin, Ireland, and Thomas Hamilton Murray, of Boston, is announced by the Carrollton Press, Woonsocket, Mass.

Mr. G. R. F. Prowse of Bradford, England, announces a book entitled *Cabot to Champlain, a Cartological Determinatian of the English, French and Iberian Discoveries between Labrador and Maine, 1487–1633*, to be published at London by Messrs. Henry Stevens, Son and Stiles. The book is to be an elaborate one, with many cartographical illustrations. Its main object is to attempt a scientific classification of as many as possible of the maps relating to the region and period mentioned (the classes being based upon some peculiarity of configuration or nomenclature which a number of maps have in common), and to extract from this classification and from the co-ordinated lists of places and names thus obtained, all possible data respecting the voyages to this coast and the developments of knowledge respecting it. Names of hagiological and liturgical origin have been especially fruitful of suggestion. The method, as described in the author's prospectus, seems to have been approached in an excellent spirit and with promise of much utility.

The British Government has brought out a new volume of the *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial; America and West Indies*, extending from 1681 to 1685.

Washington as a Soldier, by General Henry B. Carrington (Boston: Lamson, Wolffe and Co.), is in the main an abridgment of his well-known *Battles of the Revolution.*

The latest publication of the Dunlap Society is a book on *Washington and the Theatre*, by Mr. Paul Leicester Ford, in which a detailed history of Washington's attendance upon theatrical and other performances is presented, accompanied by documents illustrating the early history of the drama in America.

The second edition of Miss FitzGibbon's *A Veteran of 1812*, a biography of her grandfather, Lieutenant-Colonel James FitzGibbon, who served with distinction under Sir Isaac Brock in Canada, has just been issued by Mr. William Briggs of Toronto, with an additional chapter.

The ninth volume of Mr. Richardson's *Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents* (Government Printing Office, pp. 801) extends from March 4, 1889, to March 4, 1897. Chronologically this completes the series. But a tenth volume is promised, containing papers hitherto omitted and an index. The additional papers were in some cases omitted by accident or oversight; in other cases their inclusion is due to a widening of the plan, which now includes even those brief messages by which treaties and reports of heads of departments were transmitted to Congress. Mr. Richardson has "added to the index the enclyclopedic feature," so that it will contain "a large number of encyclopedic definitions of words and phrases used by the Chief Executives, and of other politico-historical subjects." This seems unnecessary.

The Massachusetts Historical Society has instituted a Historical Manuscripts Committee, charged to discover and keep track of valuable collections of historical manuscript in private hands, to increase the public appreciation of their value and to preserve them from destruction, to acquire them for the Society if possible, and to arrange for their calendaring and publication when this is desirable. The Committee consists of Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, chairman, Mr. Charles Francis Adams, Mr. John C. Ropes, Mr. James Schouler, Mr. James Ford Rhodes, and Professors Franklin B. Dexter and J. F. Jameson. It proposes unusually comprehensive and elaborate plans for the accomplishment of its purposes, including, among other circulars to be sent out, an appeal intended to interest school-children in the preservation of manuscript materials for history.

Mr. Robert T. Swan's *Eleventh Report on the Condition of the Public Records of Parishes, Towns and Counties* in Massachusetts renews and explains some of his earlier suggestions, and discusses with intelligence and good judgment the question of the use of the typewriter in making public records. Facsimiles are given to show what can be done with old records by the process of mounting between sheets of transparent silk. In an appendix Mr. Swan gives lists showing the location of towns in Massachusetts counties, with dates of their establishment or incorporation, so arranged as to show the towns composing any county at any given time.

After an interval of nearly three years, the Record Commissioners of the city of Boston bring out their twenty-eighth report, which, in a volume of 468 pages, well indexed, presents the marriages recorded in the town records of Boston from 1700 to 1751, collated with the Book of Banns for nearly the same period, with some additions from other sources.

Dr. Samuel A. Green, librarian of the Massachusetts Historical Society, has published the final issue (Vol. IV., No. 6) of his *Groton Historical Series*, and has furnished an elaborate index to the four volumes.

Volume XIV. of the *Early Records of the Town of Providence* has been issued by the Record Commissioners. It consists of the first deed-book proper of the town, beginning in 1677, when the town clerk began for the first time to record deeds in a separate book. The index to the book is constructed upon an improved plan.

The January number of the *Publications* of the Rhode Island Historical Society contains a historical sketch of the Greene Street school of Providence and its teachers, among whom was Margaret Fuller.

Miss Ellen Larned, the well known historian of Windham County, Conn., expects to issue, through the Preston and Rounds Company of Providence, a volume of *Historic Gleanings* derived from the same county.

The Rev. L. P. Powell, whose volume upon the *Historic Towns of New England* is noticed in the present number, is about to issue a volume of similar sketches of *Historic Towns of the Middle States*, including chapters upon New York, Brooklyn, Albany, Kingston, Newburgh, Saratoga, Schenectady, Tarrytown, Princeton, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Wilmington.

Mr. Worthington C. Ford and Mr. Paul L. Ford have presented to the New York Public Library, as a memorial of their father, Gordon L. Ford, the collection of books begun by him and since his death continued by them. It is remarkable for its works on finance and on American history and literature, particularly of the eighteenth century. Including books and pamphlets, the collection is estimated to contain between 50,000 and 100,000 volumes. The Ford collection of manuscripts has been bought by Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, who intends, after selecting certain portions of it for his own use, to present the remainder to the New York Public Library.

The *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library contains in its January number an account of the library of Samuel J. Tilden, largely historical and poetical, a description of 220 volumes of rare Americana, mostly anterior to 1550, presented by Mr. Alexander Maitland, and an elaborate catalogue of a large collection of New York broadsides recently acquired by the library. Mr. George L. Rives has recently presented a volume of transcripts from the Spanish archives at Simancas. The February issue of the *Bulletin* presents a list of the periodicals possessed by the library relating to general history (American excepted) and to archaeology. Both issues, and also that for March, continue the calendar of autographs of signers to the Declaration of Independence.

In the January number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* the principal contents are documentary: letters of Sir Henry Clinton to Lord George Germaine respecting the treason of Benedict Arnold; the letter of "Centinel X." against the Virginia militia officers in 1756; a criticism of Rall's conduct at Trenton, from the diary of Lieutenant Andreas Wiederhold; extracts from the diary of Dr. James Clitherall, who in 1776 escorted Mrs. Arthur Middleton and Mrs. Edward Rutledge on their journey to Philadelphia to join their husbands; a narrative of Captain Gustavus Conyngham, kept while in command of the

Surprise and *Revenge*, 1777–1779; and letters of Richard Henry Lee to William Whipple of New Hampshire. The editor also prints a portion of Mr. Charles R. Hildeburn's preface to the forthcoming Vol. I. of the official edition of the *Statutes-at-Large of Pennsylvania*. It seems that this admirable series, having been brought down from 1700 to 1759, is not likely at present to be carried further, appropriations failing. Vol. I., the last to be published, will contain the Pennsylvania laws anterior to 1700, some of which have eluded search till now and have been found in an unexpected place. It will also contain the commissions and the instructions (often secret and hitherto unprinted) which the Crown or the proprietors sent to their governors, documents necessary to the understanding of the history of the provincial legislation. The magazine also contains the annual reports of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, whose funds, its appears, now amount to $248,000.

Mr. Julius F. Sachse, of 4428 Pine Street, Philadelphia, the author of a book on the *German Pietists of Pennsylvania*, noticed in an earlier volume of this Review (Vol. II., p. 358) solicits subscriptions for what is practically a continuation of the same work, a book entitled *The German Sectaries of Pennsylvania, 1720–1800: A Critical and Legendary History of the Ephrata Cloister and the Dunkers*. The book will be illustrated with facsimiles of all title-pages of books printed at the Ephrata press and with other specimens of its work.

Still another series of translations and reprints of original historical documents has begun,—the *Liberty Bell Leaflets*, edited by Messrs. Martin G. Brumbaugh and Joseph S. Walton, and published inexpensively at Philadelphia, by the Christopher Sower Company. The papers to be included in the series will treat of colonial proprietary grants and interests, and of the development of institutions of local government and other institutions in the Middle Colonies. The first issue gives the inducements offered by the States General of Holland [*sic*] from 1614 to 1626, to those merchants and navigators who would discover new countries, together with the Charter of Privileges granted to the patroons. The second number contains the West Jersey Constitution of 1677; the third, Penn's Frame of Government of 1682 and the Privileges and Concessions of 1701. No. 4 contains Penn's charter of 1682.

Mr. William B. Wilson, who has for many years been connected with railroad interests in Pennsylvania, is about to publish through Messrs. Henry T. Coates and Co., an elaborate illustrated work on the *History of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company*.

The January number of the *Publications of the Southern History Association* contains an article by Mr. Thomas Featherstonhaugh, on the Mould-Builders of Central Florida, and one by Mr. James F. Shinn, on Edward Moseley, member of the governor's council of North Carolina in the early part of the eighteenth century. The number also contains (pages 54 to 57) an interesting account of the history of Miss Ann Maury's *Memoirs of a Huguenot Family*.

Rev. Dr. B. F. Riley, professor in the University of Georgia, is preparing for the American Baptist Publication Society a volume on the *History of the Baptists in the Southern States East of the Mississippi*, from 1685 to the present time.

The second report of the Maryland Geological Survey includes a report on the cartography of Maryland, by Dr. E. P. Mathews, which contains reproductions of some of the early maps, and discusses the physiographic changes which have occurred in historic times within the area of the state.

The eleventh and twelfth annual *Reports* of the Society for the History of the Germans in Maryland contain a series of reminiscences of the German Americans in Baltimore during the years 1850-1860, and therefore incidentally of the Know-Nothing movement, by Mr. L. P. Hennighausen; also a paper by Mr. Hermann Schuricht on the history of the German element in Virginia.

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* henceforth appears under the editorial care of Mr. William G. Stannard. The January issue contains a number of interesting abstracts of documents relating to the first year of the colony, taken from among the collection of abstracts from the Public Record Office in London sent over some years ago by Mr. W. Noel Sainsbury. A contemporary English text of Washington's capitulation at Fort Necessity, probably the draft laid before the House of Burgesses, is also printed, and a beginning is made of the publication of lists of the Virginia militia in the Revolution. The Isle of Wight County wills, the inventory of Robert Carter, and the abstracts of Virginia land-patents are continued. In the department of book-reviews, Mr. Alexander Brown makes an extensive reply to the elaborate criticism of his *First Republic* by Mr. William Wirt Henry in the October number of the *Magazine*. A report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Virginia Historical Society accompanies the number, and gives gratifying evidence of the activity of the Society and of intelligent plans for the future of the *Magazine*, which will hereafter pay more attention than hitherto to documents of the eighteenth century.

The January number of the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* contains an extensive diary of John Blair, member of the Council of Virginia, for the year 1751, a variety of papers relating to the founding of the college, and many family records. The April number will be wholly devoted to the records of Isle of Wight County, containing a list of the first immigrants into it; a statement of the patentees of land and the amount and location of their grants from 1619 to 1680; abstracts of the important deeds, wills, and orders in the office of the clerk of the county, 1652–1750; and abstracts from the records showing the part performed by the county during the war of the Revolution.

Mr. Richard Irby of Ashland, Va., has published *The History of Randolph-Macon College* (pp. 331), the oldest surviving college of the

Methodist church in America,—together with a brief sketch of the early history of Methodist schools in Virginia.

The second part of the *Report of the* [U. S.] *Commissioner of Education* for 1896–97 contains a historical chapter by Dr. Stephen B. Weeks on "The Beginnings of the Common-School System in the South; or Calvin Henderson Wiley, and the Organization of the Common Schools of North Carolina."

The forthcoming annual report of the state superintendent of public instruction in North Carolina will contain an elaborate account of the old schools of that state prepared by Dr. Kemp P. Battle, formerly president of the University of North Carolina and now its professor of history.

The H. and W. B. Drew Company of Jacksonville, Florida, have published a new edition, brought down to the present in respect to statistical and other facts, of George R. Fairbanks's *Florida, its History and its Romance* (pp. 240), originally published at Philadelphia in 1871.

The General Assembly of Alabama at its December session made an appropriation for the Alabama Historical Society, which, with its present revenues, will permit it each year to publish a volume of transactions. They also passed an act for the formation of an Alabama Historical Commission, charged, without compensation, to make an exhaustive examination into the sources and materials for the history of Alahama from the earliest times, printed and manuscript, including material in domestic and foreign archives and in private hands; also to acquire information respecting historic sites and buildings and other matters of historical interest. They are, at the next session of the General Assembly, to make a report, which will be printed by the state, and it is made the duty of state, county and municipal officials in Alabama to supply them with the data which they call for. The chairman of the Commission is Mr. Thomas M. Owen, secretary of the Alabama Historical Society, to whose energetic action the remarkable revival of interest in Alabama history is generally attributed. The Alabama Historical Society has arranged to celebrate on May 5, by fitting ceremonials, including an excursion from Mobile to St. Stephens, the surrender of that post by the Spaniards on May 5, 1799, the epoch at which, as a result of Ellicott's survey, American rule was substituted for that of Spain in the region north of latitude 31°.

Two new monographs have appeared among the *Contributions to American Educational History* published by the Bureau of Education: one on the history of education in Louisiana by Dr. E. W. Fay and one on the history of higher education in Missouri by Professor Marshall S. Snow.

The *Quarterly* of the Texas State Historical Association for January contains a curious private diary kept by Stephen F. Austin in 1833, 1834, and 1835 before and during his imprisonment in the City of Mexico. This highly interesting and often most amusing *document humain* was written by Austin in pencil in a small blank-book which he concealed. The present text follows a copy at present possessed by his nephew Col. Guy M. Bryan. Another very interesting article is one by I. J. Cox on the founding of the first municipality in Texas (1731), an article based on original documents in the archives of Mexico. There are also letters and sketches of early Texans. It is announced that the April number will contain a letter of Padre Manzanet giving an account of the establishment of the first mission in Texas, San Francisco de los Tejas.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin held its annual meeting on December 8. Hon. John Johnston was again elected president. The year's accessions to the library were reported as 6960 books and pamphlets and the total number is now 198,895. The Society's files of newspapers now number 10,000 bound volumes. The annotated catalogue of them, a book of about 450 pages, was issued shortly after the meeting and is noticed more fully upon another page.

At the State Historical Convention held at Madison on February 22 and 23, the leading feature, the biennial address before the State Historical Society, was a discussion of the "Movement for Federation between England and her Colonies" by Professor George B. Adams, of Yale University. Papers were also read on the Puritan, German and Norwegian elements and influences in Wisconsin, on the settlement of Beloit, on the French régime in the valley of the Fox River, on Père Allouez, and on the old fort at Fort Atkinson.

The January number of the *Annals of Iowa* contains two especially interesting articles: a careful biographical sketch of the Rt. Rev. Dr. Mathias Loras, first bishop of Dubuque, by the Rev. B. C. Lenehan, and an account by Miss Ida M. Street of an interesting attempt made in the thirties by her father, Joseph M. Street, agent for the Winnebagoes, to institute among them industrial education, an experiment conducted with much difficulty, against the opposition of the American Fur Company and of Secretary Cass.

Mr. Jay A. Bassett, librarian of the Nebraska State Historical Society, has published, under the title, *Nebraska and the Nation* (Lincoln, J. H. Miller), a second edition of his work on the *History and Government of Nebraska*.

The *Bulletin of the University of Oregon* has begun, as a Historical Series, under the editorship of Professor F. G. Young, a succession of papers intended to present a semi-centennial history of Oregon. Besides the general introduction, there will be papers on the early explorations of the Northwest coast, on the régime of the Hudson's Bay Company, on the early visits of American traders, missionaries and pioneers, and the early immigration, on the Oregon Question, on the constitutional and political history of the territory and state, and on various branches of its economic development.

The title of Mr. Beckles Willson's book relative to the Hudson Bay adventurers, to be published before long by Messrs. Scribners, is to be

The Great Company, and not that which was heretofore announced in these pages (IV. 216).

Mr. George Parker Winship has contributed to the January *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society a bibliographical letter on the early Mexican printers.

The enterprises of the Welser in Venezuela are studied, from documents in the Spanish Archives of the Indies, in Nos. 235 and 236 of the *Beilage* to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*.

Henri Froidevaux publishes in the third number of the *Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris* (pp. 91 to 148) a number of documents relating to Godin des Odonais, and to his career in Guiana between 1750 and 1773. The documents cast light on the relations between the French and Portuguese in South America and on the commercial and colonial affairs of the Amazon and of Guiana.

Mr. Adolph F. Bandelier has been occupied during the winter with excavations and surveys in the ruins at the *ingenio* of Patacamaya, near Sicasica, Bolivia. This spring, after an interval of work at La Paz, he expects to spend some time in moulding the carvings and monoliths of Tiahuanaco.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: S. E. Baldwin, *History of American Morals* (Journal of Social Science, December); A. Wirth, *Das Wachsthum der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika* (Preussische Jahrbücher, December); W. G. Sumner, *The Coin Shilling of Massachusetts Bay*, II. (Yale Review, February); *Sir George Trevelyan and the American Revolution* (Edinburgh Review, January); F. Rabbe, *Thomas Paine, d'après les Travaux récents de M. Conway* (La Révolution Française, October–January); A. B. Hart, *The United States as a World Power* (Harper's Magazine, February); A. B. Hart, *Brother Jonathan's Colonies* (Harper's Magazine, January); S. Pokagon, *The Massacre of Fort Dearborn* (Harper's Magazine, March); L. G. Bugbee, *Slavery in Early Texas*, II. (Political Science Quarterly, December); *Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War* (Edinburgh Review, January); J. W. Wyeth, *Major-General Forrest at Brice's Cross-Roads* (Harper's Magazine, March); F. A. Alger, *The "Congress" and the "Merrimac"* (New England Magazine, February); G. F. Hoar, *Four National Conventions* (Scribner's Magazine, February); H. C. Lodge, *The Spanish-American War* (Harper's Magazine, February–April); S. A. Staunton, *The Naval Campaign of 1898 in the West Indies* (Harper's Magazine, January); W. R. Shafter, *The Capture of Santiago de Cuba* (Century, February); R. P. Hobson, *The Sinking of the "Merrimac"* (Century, January–March.)

Volume IV] *July, 1899* [*Number 4*

The

American Historical Review

THE COUNTY OF ILLINOIS

THE claims of Virginia to the territory beyond the river Ohio were greatly strengthened by the campaigns of General George Rogers Clark against the British posts on the Mississippi and the Wabash. Before these campaigns Virginia's title was based upon an interpretation of the royal charters. She now had whatever rights could accrue to her from the conquest of the lands in question. It was a most cogent argument in support of her pretensions that the British posts had been reduced by Virginian valor and that they were actually in the possession of Virginian troops. The legislature of that commonwealth was awake to the advantages of the situation, and in October, 1778, it enacted a law entitled "An act establishing the County of Ilinois, and for the more effectual protection and defence thereof."[1] The preamble recited that "by a successful expedition carried on by the Virginia militia, on the western side of the Ohio river, several British posts within the territory of this commonwealth, in the country adjacent to the river Mississippi, have been reduced, and the inhabitants have acknowledged themselves citizens thereof, and taken the oath of fidelity to the same, and the good faith and safety of the commonwealth require that the said citizens should be supported and protected by speedy and effectual reinforcements, which will be the best means of preventing the inroads and depredations of the Indians upon the inhabitants to the westward of the Allegheny mountains." The preamble further stated that it was expedient to establish some temporary form of government adapted to the circumstances of the people west of the mountains, since it would be "difficult, if not impracticable, to govern them by the present laws of this commonwealth, until proper information, by intercourse with their fellow citizens, on the east side of the Ohio, shall have familiarized them to the same."[1] In order to provide a government suited to the peculiar condition of the inhabitants, the vast region beyond the Ohio which now comprises five great states was erected into a county called the "County of Ilinois." The governor of Virginia was empowered to appoint a county lieutenant or commandant-in-chief in the county, and he in turn was to appoint and commission as many deputy commandants, militia officers and commissaries as he should deem proper. In both cases the officers thus provided for were to hold their positions during the pleasure of the appointing power. Little was said about the powers and duties of the county lieutenant. In all criminal cases wherein the accused was convicted, the county lieutenant might grant a pardon, except in cases of murder and treason. In such cases he could cause execution to be postponed until the sense of the governor, in the case of murder, and of the General Assembly, in the case of treason, could be ascertained. He was required to convene the citizens in the various districts for the election of such civil officers as they had been accustomed to under the French-English régime prior to Clark's expedition. Officers thus chosen were to be commissioned by the county lieutenant, and were to have the jurisdiction and powers exercised by them under the laws to which the inhabitants of the county had been accustomed. All civil officers were required to take the oath of fidelity to the commonwealth and the oath of office according to the form of their own religion; and full civil and religious liberty was guaranteed to them and to all the inhabitants of the county. Such civil officers as the inhabitants had been accustomed to were to be paid for their services in the same manner as such expenses had formerly been borne; but where any other officers were directed to be appointed by this act, the governor, with the advice of his council, was authorized to issue warrants on the treasury of the commonwealth for the payment of their salaries. The repeated references made to the laws to which the people had been accustomed are indicative of a desire on the part of the legislature to make the transition from one régime to another as easy as possible. By preserving local customs and local organs of government, and by introducing few new officials, it was hoped that the change could be accomplished with little disturbance.

---

[1] Hening, *Statutes at Large*, IX. 552–555.

For the protection and defence of the new county, the governor was authorized to raise and equip five hundred men, who should march at once to the Illinois country to garrison the forts and stations that had been taken. The governor was to meet the expenses of this military occupation by drawing warrants upon the treasurer of the commonwealth.

---

[1] Hening, IX. 553.

The temporary character of this county organization was evident not only from the declaration to that effect in the preamble, but also from the fact that the act of establishment was expressly limited in its operation. It was to be in force "for and during the period of twelve months, and from thence to the end of the next session of assembly, and no longer."[1] In May, 1780, the act was continued "for one year after the passing of this act, and from thence to the end of the next session of assembly."[2] The statutory organization of Illinois expired therefore in 1781, and from that time until the passage of the Ordinance of 1787, there was no government resting upon positive provisions of law in the territory northwest of the river Ohio.[3]

Patrick Henry, then governor of Virginia, soon took the necessary steps for putting the new government into operation. On December 12, 1778, he appointed John Todd county lieutenant or commandant, and addressed to him a statesmanlike letter of instructions.[4] He said:

> "The Grand Objects which are disclosed to the View of your countrymen will prove Benificial or otherwise according to the Vallue and Abilities of those who are called to Direct the affairs of that remote Country. The present crisis rendered so favourable by the Good Disposition of the French and Indians may be Improv'd to Great purposes, but if unhapily it Should be lost, a returne of the Same attachments to us may never happen. Considering, therefore, that earley Prejudices are so hard to weare Out, you will Take Care to Cultivate and conciliate the affections of the French and Indians.
>
> "Altho Great reliance is placed on your prudence in managing the people you are to reside amoung, yet consider'g you as unacquainted in some Degree with their Genius, usages, and maners, as well as the Geography of the Cuntry, I recommend it to you to consult and advise with the most inteligable and upright persons who may fall in your way.
>
> "You are to give pertiklar Attention to Col° Clark and his Corps, to whome the State has Great Obligations. You are to coöperate with him on any military undertaking when necessary, and to Give the military every Aid which the circumstance of the people will admit of. the

---

[1] Hening, *Statutes at Large*, IX. 555.

[2] *Id.*, X. 303

[3] The ordinance for the government of the western territory adopted by Congress in 1784 was never put into operation.

[4] John Todd's Record Book, *Chicago Historical Society's Collections*, IV. 289–293. Governor Henry's letter has been reprinted several times, and with very considerable variations. It may be found in Edwards, *History of Illinois and Life of Ninian Edwards*, in English, *The Conquest of the Northwest*, and in Henry, *Patrick Henry*, III. 212–216. Of the copy in Todd's Record Book, Mr. E. G. Mason said that it "probably is in Patrick Henry's handwriting. At all events his own signature is subscribed thereto." The extracts from the letter given in this paper are reproduced with verbal and literal exactness as they appear in Todd's Record Book.

Inhabitints of the Ilinoiss must not expect setled peace and safety while theire and Our enimyes have footing at Detroit and can Intercept or Stop the Trade of the Mississippi. If the English have not the Strength or Courage to come to warr against us Themselves, there practice has been and Will be to hire the savages to commit murders and depredations. Ilinoiss must expect to pay in these a large price for her freedom unless the English can be Expelled from Detroit. the means of Effecting this will not perhaps be found in your or Col° Clark's power, but the French inhabitating the neighbourhood of that place, it is prosumed, may be brought to see it Done with indiferrence or perhaps Joyne in the Enterprize with pleasure. this is but conjecture. when you are on the Spot you and Col° Clark may Discover its fallacey, or reallity if the former appears, defence only is to be the Object. if the latter or a good prospect of it, I hope the Frenchmen and Indians at your Disposial will shew a Zeal for the affaire eaquel to the Benefits to be Derived from Establishing Liberty and permanent peace.

"One Great Good expected from Holding the Ilinoiss is to overaw the Indians from warring on our Settlers on this side the Ohio. a close attention to the Disposition, carector, and movments of the Hostile Tribes is therefore nessary for you the forces and militia at Ilinoiss by being placed on the back of them may inflict timly Chasetizement on these enemies, whose Towns are an easy prey in absince of their Warriors.

"You perceive by these hints that something in the military line may be Expected from you so farr as the Occasion calls for the assistance of the people composing the militia it will be necessary to cooperate with the Troops sent from here. and I know of no better Gen^l. Direction to Give than this, that you Consider yourself at the head of the Civill department, and as Such having the Comm^d of the militia, who are not to be under the Comm^d of the military untill ordered out by the Civil Authority, and to Act in conjuction with them.

"You are on all Accatons to inculcate on the people the Value of liberty and the Differrence between the State of free Citizens of this Comonwelth and that Slavery to which the Ilinoiss was Destined. A free and equal representation may be Expected by them in a little Time, together with all the improvm^ts in Jurisprudence and police which the Other parts of the State enjoy.

"It is necessary for the Hapiness, increase and prosperity of that Cuntrey that the Greaveances that obstruct these blessings be known in order to their removall, let it therefore be your Care to obtain information on that subject that proper plans may be formed for the Generall Utillity. Let it be your Constant Attention to see that the inhabitints have Justice administred to them for any Injury rec^d from the Troops, the omission of this may be fatall. Col° Clark has Instructions on this Head, and will, I Doubt not, exert himself to curb all licentious practises of the Soldiery, which if unrestrained would produce the most banefull effects.

"You will also Discountinence and punish every attempt to Violate the property of the Indians, perticularly in their lands. Our enemys have alarmed them much on that score, but I hope from your prudence and Justice that no grounds of Compl^t will be administred on this Subject.

"You will embrace every opertunity to manifest the high reguard and frendly sentiments of this Commonwelth towards all the Subjects of his Catholic Majesty, for whose safity, prosperity, and advantage [advancement] you will give every possible advantage. You will make a

Tender of the Frendship and Services of yr people to the Spanish Commandant neare Kaskaskia, and Cultivate the Strictest Connection with him and his people. I deliver you a letter which you will hand to him in person.

"The Ditaile of your Duty in the civil Department I need not give you, its best Direction will be found in yr innate love of Justice and Zeal, to be intencively usefull to your fellow-men. A general Direction to act according to the best of yr Judgment in cases where these Instructions are Silent and the laws have not Otherwise Directed is given to you from the necessity of the Case, for yr Great Distance from Govermt will not permit you to wait for Orders in many Cases of Great Importance.

"in your negociations with the Indians confine the stipulan as much as possible to the single object of obtaining peace from them. Touch not the subject of land or bounderies till pertickr Orders are recd; when necessity requrs it, presents may be made, but be as frugall in that matter as possible and let them know that Goods at present is Scarce with us, but we expect soon to Trade freely with all the world, and they shall not want when we can get them.

"The matters given you in Charge are Singular in their Nature and Weighty in their Consequences to the people imediately concerned and to the whole State.. they require the fullest exertion of yr Abillitys and Unwearied Diligence . . . ."

On the same day, Governor Henry addressed a letter to George Rogers Clark, directing him to retain the command of all the troops within the boundaries of the new county. As in the case of Todd, he was instructed to cultivate the good will of the French and Indians. He was especially cautioned to adopt severe discipline with his troops in order to prevent their doing any injury to the persons or property of the inhabitants. The letter continues, "John Todd, Esq., being appointed county lieutenant according to law during pleasure, with ample power chiefly confined to the civil department, will have directions to act in concert with you whenever it can be done. On your part you will omit no opportunity to give him the necessary co-operation of the troops when the case necessarily requires it. Much depends upon the mutual assistance you will occasionally afford each other in your respective departments, and I trust that a sincere cordiality will subsist between you—the contrary will prove highly detrimental."[1]

Colonel Todd soon took his departure for the scene of his duties and arrived at Kaskaskia in May, 1779.[2] Prior to his arrival Colonel Clark had given some attention to civil affairs, but they were not to his taste and he gladly welcomed the coming of Todd.[3] The latter began at once to organize the government in accordance with the instructions that he had received. On May 14 he organized the militia, appointing Richard Winston deputy commandant at Kaskaskia and issuing commissions to Nicholas Janis and Joseph Duplassey as captains of companies. On May 17 he appointed François Trottier to be deputy commandant at Cahokia, while Jean Bte. Barbeau was assigned to the same office at Prairie du Rocher.[1] In thus providing for the defense of his people against attacks from without before attempting to deal with purely civil affairs, Todd acted in accordance with the practice which must prevail in all such cases. The first need of a primitive community is for protection. In this instance the situation of the people was peculiarly hazardous. Their position on the frontier exposed them to attacks from the Indians surrounding them, as well as from the troops of the British, who were anxious to recover their lost fortresses. Hence the wisdom of the earliest possible organization of the militia.

---

[1] Draper Collection, Clark MSS., LX. 1–4; Henry's *Patrick Henry*, III. 209–212.

[2] Letter of George Rogers Clark to George Mason, Nov. 19, 1779, *Ohio Valley Historical Series*, III. 84. It is said that the French inhabitants greeted Todd with shouts of "Vive le roi!"

[3] *Id.*, III. 85.

Todd next turned his attention to civil affairs. In compliance with Governor Henry's instructions he assembled the people for the election of civil officers and especially for the choice of judges of the courts at Vincennes, Cahokia and Kaskaskia. This election marked a great change in the political organization of the people. Courts had existed in Illinois for some time, but they had administered the laws of a distant kingdom and the people had had no choice in the selection of the judges. This was undoubtedly the first election held in Illinois.[2] With but one exception all the officers chosen bore French names.[3] Several of those to whom Todd had given commissions in the militia were also elected to civil office. Among them were Richard Winston, deputy commandant at Kaskaskia, who was elected sheriff at Kaskaskia: and François Trottier, deputy commandant at Cahokia, who was elected a member of the court at that place. Four of the nine judges of the court of Kaskaskia, four of the seven judges of the court of Cahokia, and five of the nine judges of the court of Vincennes had already received military commissions from Colonel Todd. It has been suggested that the selection of persons already holding office was due to the lack of persons properly qualified to fill the places still remaining vacant.[4] This difficulty, which might easily occur in a frontier community, was not soon removed. More than fifteen years later Governor St. Clair complained that it was impossible to

[1] Todd's Record Book, *Chicago Historical Society's Collections*, IV. 294 *seq.*

[2] E. G. Mason in the *Magazine of American History*, VIII. 590.

[3] Lists of the officers elected are given in Todd's Record Book, *Chicago Historical Society's Collections*, IV. 295.

[4] Moses, *Illinois*, I. 160.

find persons in the Northwest Territory who were properly qualified for the office of judge.[1]

The inauguration of the new government was attended with many difficulties, two of which especially imperilled its success. The first was the sparseness of population in the vast area under Todd's jurisdiction. His authority extended from Pittsburg to the Mississippi—from the Ohio to the Great Lakes. Even in 1795, Governor St. Clair estimated the whole population of this region to be only fifteen thousand.[2] The country was too thinly settled to sustain any elaborate frame of government, and it was found almost impossible to carry out the simple provisions of that which had been established. The arm of the executive could not reach every part of the county, and as a result many isolated settlements were practically without any organized government.[3] The second difficulty in the way of the new government was the fact that the population was largely French. They were strangers to the governmental policy which was now established over them. They wished not so much to govern as to be governed. The forms of the common law, trial by jury, popular elections,—indeed, the idea that they themselves were to shape the fortunes of the new government—all these belonged to a polity to which they were unaccustomed, and were innovations which they received with little favor.

The civil department of the government of Illinois county consisted of two parts. The first was the executive, represented in the beginning by Colonel Todd; the second was the courts, which were elected by the people in accordance with Governor Henry's instructions. Todd seems to have entered with zeal upon the performance of his duties; but his path was not one of roses and he soon asked to be relieved of his office. In August, 1779, only three months after his arrival, he wrote to Governor Henry that he would resign the following spring. The unwholesome air, his distance from his connections, the unfamiliarity with the language, and the impossibility of procuring many of the conveniences of life combined to render his situation uncomfortable, and made him anxious to lay down his office.[4] And there were other things which made him dissatisfied with his position. His relations with Captain McCarty, the commander of the troops at Cahokia, were far from cordial. According to Todd, McCarty had endeavored to make the civil power subordinate to the military at Cahokia and had incurred the hatred of the inhabitants.[1] He was unable to maintain his authority, and the people told him that nobody had sent for him, that nobody wanted him, and threatened to drive him and his men away. As a result, most of his French soldiers deserted in the summer and fall of 1779.[2] McCarty attributed the unfriendly disposition of the inhabitants to Colonel Todd, and in a letter to Colonel Montgomery he said, "Col. Todd's residence here will spoil the people entirely, for the inhabitants no more regard us than a parcel of slaves. . . . I think it would be a happy thing could we get Col. Todd out of the country, for he will positively set the inhabitants and us by the ears. . . . I have never seen the people of this place so mutinous as they are by the encouragement of Col. Todd, for they even begin to threaten to turn my men out of doors, and God knows what I shall do if they do, for we are not above 20 strong and them sick that I could depend on so they may starve us if they like."[3] McCarty also wrote a sharp letter to Todd, accusing him of inciting the people to kill his hogs, which were running about in the open fields.[4] The exasperation aroused by the loss and destruction of his property embittered him against Todd and his government and made Todd's position even more uncomfortable than before.[5]

---

[1] *St. Clair Papers*, II. 348.

[2] Burnet, *Notes on the Early Settlement of the Northwestern Territory*, p. 31.

[3] The French settlements in Illinois seem to have been unable to devise any sort of government for themselves. In striking contrast is the political aptitude of the English, an excellent example of which is afforded by the people of Clarksville, a little settlement on the Ohio River, opposite Louisville, Kentucky. As Congress made no provision for their government, they held a convention and adopted a constitution. A year later they held another convention and amended their constitution. Both the constitution and the amendment are printed in the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, II. 691.

[4] John Todd Papers, *Chicago Historical Society's Collections*, IV. 319.

---

[1] *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, I. 460.

[2] Letter from Capt. John Williams to General Clark, Sept. 25, 1779. Draper Collection, Clark MSS., XLIX., No. 73.

[3] Draper Collection, Clark MSS., XLIX., No. 71.

[4] *Id.*, XLIX., No. 72.

[5] A year later, October 14, 1780, McCarty wrote to Todd a humble letter of retractation, in which he said, "Sir, When shall I begin to appollagize for the Different light and Oppinion, I saw and had of You when hear last Year, and now. the Spirit of a free subject that you inculcated thro' your better knowledge of things was hid to me. In short, Honour requires of me to render You the Justice you desarve, and at the same time to inform you the reason of my altering my notions of things. I then thought the Troops hear would be duly supported by the State, and the Legal expence for them paid to the people Justly. I had thought the duty of an Officer who had any Command was to see Justice done his Soldiers, and that they had their Rights without wronging his Country. I then thought it was also his Duty to fore see and use all manner of occonomie in Laying up Provisions for these Soldiers, to carry on any Opperation that his supperiours should judge expedient to order him on, without any regard to private interests whatever, but for the Good of the State he served. I then never Immagined that an Agent would be sent hear to Trade in connection with a Private Person to Purchase the Certificates from the people at such rates which must appear scandulous and Dishonorable to the State.

"To the contrary of all which I am now convinced by occular Demonstration; in short we are become the Hated Beasts of a whole people by Pressing horses, Boats &c &c, Killing cattle &c &c, for which no valuable consideration is given; even many not a certificate, which is hear looked on as next to nothing.

"I have sent Col: Clarke, in an Extract from my Journal, the proceedings as far as I

Todd carried out the intention which he had expressed to Governor Henry, and resigned in 1780.[1] He removed to Kentucky and apparently did not visit Illinois again. He was probably succeeded by Thimothé Demunbrunt, a Frenchman who had served as a lieutenant under General Clark during Governor Hamilton's invasion of the Illinois country in 1778–79. There is considerable doubt as to the exact position which this officer held in the government. Governor St. Clair says that when Todd left Illinois, Demunbrunt was substituted for him.[2] Demunbrunt himself, in a petition which he addressed to the state of Virginia asking compensation for the presents which he had made to the Indians at Kaskaskia in order to preserve their neutrality, says that when Colonel Winston was appointed to the command of Illinois, the colonel had appointed him to be commandant of the village of Kaskaskia, and he had continued in that office until the arrival of Governor St. Clair.[3] His position therefore was not the same as that which Todd had held, although he performed many of the duties of county lieutenant.

The other department of the civil organization consisted of the courts. These bodies were established at Kaskaskia, Cahokia, and Vincennes. They consisted of a clerk, a sheriff, and a body of judges varying in number from six to nine. They must have possessed some executive powers in addition to their judicial functions, for Todd sought their concurrence and assistance in certain of his measures.[4] All the judges whose names appear in Todd's Record Book were French by birth or descent, and hence had not become ac-

---

know, of one Col: De la Balme, and his raising a Party to go Against Detroit, Not being a Commander I cannot say whether he has proper authority so to do or not. . . . The people have sent by him memorials to Congress or the French envoy at Philadelphia setting forth all the evils we have done. I think Government should be informed of this, as the people are now entirely allinated Agst us; he has told Indians, french Troops will be hear in the Spring. I have no right to find fault, or Blame my Supperiours, yet I have a right to see plain, and wish for the Credit of the State, that Government had Eyes to see hear as Plaine as I do."—*Virginia Calendar of State Papers*, I. 379.

[1] Thomas Jefferson, who succeeded Patrick Henry as governor of Virginia, expressed his regret at this step. "I am sorry you think of resigning your office in the Illinois. the withdrawing of our troops from thence will render the presence of a person of established authority more essential than ever. Your complaints concerning your allowance we think too well grounded, and will lay them before the Assembly in May, who we doubt not will remove them. the other objections, I am in hopes you can get over. It would give us much concern should any necessity oblige you to leave that Country at all, and more especially as early as you speak of." John Todd Papers, *Chicago Historical Society's Collections*, IV. 359.

[2] *St. Clair Papers*, II. 169; *American State Papers, Public Lands*, I. 19. A memorandum on the inside of the back cover of Todd's Record Book dated 1779 is signed, "Nous, Thimothé Demunbrunt, Lt. Comd^{t}. Par interim, &c &c &c." A similar inscription appears on page 39 of the Record Book.

[3] *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, V. 408.

[4] Todd's Record Book, *Chicago Historical Society's Collections*, IV. 298, 302

quainted by intercourse with the system of law which they were to administer. Such being the case, it is not surprising that they displayed little zeal in the execution of their office. When Todd returned from a visit to Vincennes in July, 1779, he found that the court of Kaskaskia had adjourned to a distant day, hoping thus to rid themselves of an unfamiliar system of law. Todd issued a sharp order to them to hold court at once on that very day, "any adjournment to the contrary notwithstanding."[1] For a number of months thereafter, the sessions of the court at Kaskaskia were probably held with some semblance of regularity. As late as 1787, the court convened almost every month, but its chief task seems to have been to meet and adjourn. Little business was done. From June 5, 1787, to February 15, 1788, but two cases were tried by the judges. At the session of January 15, 1788, the first trace of the jury system is found. On that day the court ordered that jurymen who came from Prairie du Rocher should each receive twenty-five livres, while those from Bellefontaine should have forty-five livres. At the same session a jury was selected for the trial of two cases then pending against one Thomas Green. It is a noticeable fact that while all the judges of the court are French, all the jurymen, as well as all the parties to the cases tried by them, bear English names.[2]

After Todd left the Illinois country, in the early part of 1780, the government became much demoralized. The statute of Virginia under which it was organized expired in 1781, but many of the civil officers, particularly the courts, continued to exercise some of their functions. Demunbrunt made grants of land without number. The courts also assumed this power and exercised it freely. They claimed to act by the authority of Todd, whom they styled the Grand Judge for the United States. But Todd was not empowered to make such grants himself, and it is not probable that he attempted to delegate any such authority to the courts. All these grants were afterwards disallowed by Governor St. Clair, but he recommended that persons who had actually settled upon such lands and made improvements thereon be given a right of preemption.[1]

---

[1] Todd's Record Book, *Chicago Historical Society's Collections*, IV. 304.

[2] Todd's Record Book, *Chicago Historical Society's Collections*, IV. 308 *seq.* Todd's Record Book shows that sessions of the court at Kaskaskia were held as follows:

June 5, 1787, adjourned to July 5, 1787.
July 25, 1787, " " August 22, 1787.
September 27, 1787, adjourned to October 15, 1787.
October 15, 1787, adjourned to November 15, 1787.
October 25, 1787, extra session, by request of Demunbrunt and François Carbonaux.
November 15, 1787.
November 16, 1787, adjourned to November 21, 1787.
November 24, 1887, " " December 20, 1787.
November 26, 1787, extra session, by request of "Mr. hugt hunard."
December 11, 1787, extra session, same case.
December 20, 1787, adjourned to December 28, 1787.
December 28, 1787, " " January 15, 1788.
January 15, 1788, " " February 15, 1788.
February 15, 1788, court was adjourned until a public assembly should be held.

In October, 1780, Richard Winston, sheriff and commandant at Kaskaskia, wrote to Todd that the military forces were trying to bring the entire government under their control and throw off the civil authority. The home government had of late manifested little interest in Illinois affairs, and Winston concludes in a discouraged tone, "The generality of the people are of the opinion that this country will be given up to France."[2] The situation did not improve. In 1783, the commissioners of the state of Virginia reported to the governor that the Illinois country was in great confusion for the lack of some one with authority to enforce order. The French inhabitants were not well inclined toward Virginia, and the neighboring Indians, who had hitherto been friendly, or at least neutral, were going over to the British. The commissioners finally gave it as their opinion that Virginia must speedily take coercive measures if she expected to retain control of the region.[3] In the same year Walker Daniel, in a statement dated "New Holland, Feb. 3, 1783," addressed to the Board of Commissioners for the Western Department, said that Mons. Carboneaux, the prothonotary and notary public for the Illinois settlements, had come on a mission to represent the condition of the Illinois country and to obtain some measure of relief. Carboneaux reported that the settlements were wholly without law or government, and that the magistrates, whether from indolence or from sinister motives, had for some time been so remiss in the administration of their office that they had now lost all authority. The greatest disorder prevailed. The most flagrant crimes were committed with impunity. A man might be murdered in his own house and the criminal go unpunished, since the settlements possessed neither sheriff nor prisons. In the midst of this confusion, many persons had made large purchases of land, amounting in some cases to three and four hundred leagues, with the intention of establishing themselves as lords of the soil, as had been done in Canada. Carboneaux suggested that a new officer, whom he calls the President of Judicature, should be sent to the settlements. This officer should be vested with wide executive power, and in every village there should be subordinate civil officers with authority to decide all causes upon obligation not exceeding three hundred dollars. For higher amounts there should be at Kaskaskia a court composed of the president and a majority of the magistrates. He admitted that there was no man in the Illinois country of sufficient ability and influence to fill the office of president, and hence some one would have to be sent from Virginia. Carboneaux also thought that a company of regulars should be put under the command of the president for a year or two in order to maintain order and authority.[1] In spite of the urgency of the case as depicted by Carboneaux, the government of Virginia seems to have taken no action.[2]

---

[1] *St. Clair Papers*, II. 196; *American State Papers*, *Public Lands*, I. 19.

[2] *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, I. 381. As to relations with France, compare with Captain McCarty's letter, *ante*, p. 630, note 5.

[3] Draper Collection, Clark MSS., LX., Illinois Papers, No. 3, 52–3.

Although the state of Virginia had organized the whole country northwest of the River Ohio into a county under her jurisdiction, large parts of it were claimed by other states. But between the years 1781 and 1786, as a result chiefly of the attitude taken by Maryland toward the ratification of the Articles of Confederation, all these claims were ceded to the United States;[3] and it was to Congress, therefore, that the people of Kaskaskia, in the summer of 1786, addressed a petition to be provided with a government. To this the reply was made that a plan for their temporary government was under consideration and would be delayed no longer than was necessary.[4] In the following year, General Harmar visited the settlements, and reported to the Secretary of War that "all these people are entirely unacquainted with what Americans call liberty. Trial by jury, etc., they are strangers to. A commandant with a few troops to give them orders is the best form of government for them; it is what they have been accustomed to."[5]

Although the County of Illinois embraced within its limits all the lands beyond the Ohio to which Virginia laid claim, the actual authority of the government of the county never extended beyond the French settlements along the Mississippi and the Wabash. And later when the western lands were ceded to the United States and the government under the Ordinance of 1787 was organized, it was some time before any effects of the change were seen in the old French towns. Governor St. Clair inaugurated the government of the Northwest Territory at Marietta, July 15, 1788. The governor and judges, acting as the territorial legislature, immediately began the enactment of legislation which, in so far as it was of a general nature, applied equally to all parts of the territory. But the measures adopted by the government of St. Clair, like those adopted by the government of Todd, were effective only in the group of settlements in which the executive resided. The acts of the legislature at Marietta had no effect on the Mississippi. Whatever government existed in the French settlements was simply a survival of the Virginia county; and this government, which was never very efficient, grew constantly worse. Todd had made a conscientious effort to establish political institutions according to the ideas of government which prevailed east of the Alleghenies. But the indifference and political incapacity of the French, joined with the inherent difficulties of the situation, defeated his efforts. Demunbrunt's chief activity seems to have been the making of grants of lands. Of actual government there was very little. The county was happily characterized by Governor Reynolds as "a kind of obsolete existence." Legally it ceased to exist in 1781; but some of its forms were kept up until April 27, 1790, when Governor St. Clair organized a part of it into a new county which he called St. Clair County. All semblance of government under the authority of Virginia then came to an end in the Northwest.

---

[1] Draper Collection, Clark MSS., LX., Illinois Papers, No. 3, 1–4. Mons. Carboneaux "appears to have been instructed as to the ground of his message by the better disposed parts of the inhabitants of the country whose complaints he represents." *Ibid.*

[2] Carboneaux afterward carried his petition to Congress and on February 21, 1785, Congress resolved "That one or more commissioners be appointed to repair to the Kaskaskies and Illinois settlements," and the following Thursday was assigned for the election of one commissioner. *Journals of Congress*, IV. 473. Neither the *Journals* nor the *Secret Journals* of Congress contain any further reference to the election of these commissioners. On March 4, 1785, Congress resolved "That 300 dollars be advanced to Francis Carboneaux, agent for the inhabitants of the Kaskaskies and St. Vincents, for which sum he is to be accountable; and that the president draw a warrant accordingly." *Journals of Congress*, IV. 477.

[3] But Connecticut did not cede her jurisdiction over the Western Reserve until 1800.

[4] *Journals of Congress*, IV. 688.

[5] *St. Clair Papers*, II. 32. As early as September 25, 1779, Captain John Williams had expressed a similar opinion in a letter to General Clark. He said the people were very discontented, and he added in an explanatory tone, "The civil law has ruined them." Draper Collection, Clark MSS., XLIX., No. 73.

CARL EVANS BOYD.

HIDALGO AND MORELOS

ALTHOUGH the political functions of the Spanish Inquisition have been greatly exaggerated by a certain school of writers there can be no question that, except when the prerogatives of the Holy See were involved, it was always ready to assist its masters and to demonstrate that the cause of the state was the cause of religion. This was especially the case in the later stage of its career after the outbreak of the French Revolution had threatened the monarchical principle, and it is prominently manifested in the trials, by the Inquisition of Mexico, of the two foremost martyrs of the war of independence—Hidalgo and Morelos.[1]

Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, the parish priest of Los Dolores, who first raised the standard of revolt in conjunction with Allende, Aldama and Abasolo, and who was elected generalissimo of the insurgent army, was a singularly interesting character. Born in 1753, he received his education at the university of San Nicolás in Valladolid (Michoacan), where he became rector and theological professor. In the formal accusation presented during his trial it is asserted that he took only the degree of bachelor and refused to present himself for that of doctor because he said the faculty were a pack of ignoramuses; that he was known while there as *el zorro*, or the fox, because of his cunning, and that he was finally expelled in consequence of a scandalous adventure in the course of which he was obliged to escape at night through a window of the chapel—but such statements may be received with allowance. Taking orders, he finally settled at Los Dolores as *cura*, where, in spite of a large revenue, he encumbered himself with debts. He was fond of music and dancing and gaming, and his relations with women were of a character common enough with the clergy of the period. His abounding energy led him to establish potteries and to introduce silk-culture, which may doubtless account for his indebtedness. He was regarded as a prodigy of learning and kept up his intellectual interests, translating tragedies of Racine and comedies of Molière, the latter of which he caused to be acted in his house, his favorite being Tartufe. The priest Garcia de Carrasqueda, who enjoyed his intimacy for twelve or thirteen years, when on trial before the Inquisition, deposed that they used to read together Cicero, Serry, Fleury's *Ecclesiastical History*, Rollin's *Ancient History* and an Italian work on commerce by Genovesi, and that he praised highly the orations of Æschines and Demosthenes, Bossuet, Buffon's *Natural History*, Pitaval's *Causes Célèbres* and various historical books. He was fond of discussing questionable points in theology and emitting opinions not wholly orthodox on such subjects as the stigmata of St. Francis, the House of Loreto, the Veronica, whether St. Didymus or Gestas was the penitent thief, the transmission of original sin, the identity of the Three Kings and the like, and his high reputation for learning caused him to be accepted as an authority. Altogether he presents himself to us as a man of unusual physical and intellectual energy, not overnice as to the employment of those energies, of wide culture, of vigorous and inquiring mind and of small reverence for formulas or for authority.

---

[1] The following details, for the most part I believe hitherto inedited, are derived, in so far as concerns the trial of Hidalgo, from a transcript of the original records, made in 1865 by Señor José María Lafragua and kindly communicated to me by David Fergusson, Esq.

As regards the trial of Morelos my authority is a report of the Inquisitor Flores, accompanied with the documents, made to the Supreme Council of the Inquisition, November 27 and December 29, 1815. It is preserved in the Archives of Simancas, Inquisicion, Sala 39, Legajo 1473.

Such a character was not likely to escape the notice of the Holy Office, and as early as July 16, 1800, Fray Joaquin Huesca, of the order of Merced and a teacher of philosophy, denounced him to the commissioner of Valladolid for various unorthodox utterances at which Fray Manuel Estrada of the same order had been present, and the latter on being examined confirmed and exaggerated the accusation. In transmitting this to the tribunal, July 19, the commissioner reported that Hidalgo was a most learned man who had ruined himself with gambling and women, that he read prohibited books which perverted his spirit, and that while professor of theology he had taught from Jansenist works. The Inquisition necessarily undertook an investigation which lasted for more than a year and included the testimony of thirteen witnesses, with the result of showing that Hidalgo had denied the doctrine of rewards and punishments in this life and the authenticity of the texts on which it was based; he had spoken disparagingly of the popes, one of whom was probably in hell, and of the government of the church by ignoramuses; he had asserted that no Jew of sound judgment could be converted because there was no proof that the Messiah had come; he had denied the perpetual virginity of the Virgin, and had asserted that transubstantiation and auricular confession were unknown to the primitive church, and he had assented to the popular error that there was no sin in fornication. He was described as revolutionary in his tendencies, speaking of monarchs as tyrants, and cherishing aspirations for liberty; he was well read in current French literature and had little respect for the censorship—in short, he was an *afrancesado.* The commissioner of San Miguel el Grande reported, March 11, 1801, much about Hidalgo's disorderly life, and that he carried the Alcoran about with him, but in a second report, of April 13, he stated that during the recent Easter Hidalgo had reformed, a matter which was widely discussed and seems to have attracted general attention. In due time, on September 18, 1801, all the testimony was laid before the fiscal, or prosecuting officer of the Inquisition, who reported, October 2, that if Hidalgo had uttered the propositions attributed to him he should be arrested with sequestration of property, but that the witnesses were contradictory, while Estrada had the reputation of an habitual liar. He therefore recommended that the case be suspended and the papers be filed away for future reference, to which the tribunal assented.

Nothing more was heard about Hidalgo until July 22, 1807, when a priest named José María Castilblane came forward to say that in 1801 Estrada had told him scandalous and heretical things concerning him. More serious was a denunciation made, May 4, 1808, by María Manuela Herrera, aged forty-one and described as a woman of good reputation who frequented the sacraments. By command of her confessor she deposed that she had once lived with Hidalgo as his concubine, when he told her that Christ had not died on the cross but that it was another man; also that there was no hell—this latter, she supposed, being to quiet her conscience, for they had an agreement that she was to provide him with women and he was to provide her with men. This was again laid before the fiscal who reported, June 8, in favor of awaiting further proof. Then, March 15, 1809, Fray Diego Manuel Bringas deposed that he had found Hidalgo in possession of prohibited books, such as Serry's *History of the Congregations De Auxiliis*, both under his own name and that of Augustin Leblanc; also his *Dissertations on Christ and the Virgin*, in which he speaks without measure of María de Agreda and that Hidalgo praised this work and called María a deluded old woman.[1] Still, with singular moderation, no action was taken to check Hidalgo's audacity and had he been content to leave politics alone it is safe to say that the Inquisition would not have troubled him, though it was vexing hundreds of others with far less excuse.

---

[1] The learned Dominican Jacques-Augustin Serry's *Historia Congregationum de Auxiliis*, issued also under the name of Augustin Leblanc, is in the Spanish Index (*Indice Ultimo*, p. 249) but not in the Roman. His *Exercitationes de Christo ejusque V. Matre* are in both.

María de Agreda was a Spanish mystic of the seventeenth century in behalf of whose canonization Spain has made persistent and hitherto unsuccessful appeals to the Holy See. Her *Ciudad Mistica de Dios* has been more than once condemned in Rome but has escaped a permanent place on the Index through consideration for Spanish susceptibility.

When, however, he started the revolution, September 16, 1810, this lethargy gave place to the utmost activity. The official Gazette of September 28 asserted that he was disseminating among the people the doctrine that there is neither hell, purgatory, nor glory; an extract from this was forthwith sent by the Inquisition to its commissioner at Querétaro with instructions to obtain verification, which he had no trouble in doing, although the evidence was purely hearsay. Without waiting for this, however, the testimony which had so long slumbered in the archives of the *secreto* was laid before the *calificadores* or examiners, October 9, with instructions to report at once. This they did the next day to the effect that as Hidalgo was a sectary of French liberty they pronounced him a libertine, seditious, schismatic, a formal heretic, a Judaizer, a Lutheran, a Calvinist and strongly suspect of atheism and materialism. It was not difficult to reach such conclusions in view of successive edicts of the Inquisition which had been issued in 1808 and 1809 directed against all proclamations and emissaries seeking to pervert the loyalty of the colonists in favor of the ambitious schemes of Napoleon, for in these the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people was defined to be a manifest heresy.

Immediately on receiving the report of the examiners the tribunal resolved that, as Hidalgo was surrounded by his army of insurgents and could not be arrested, he should be summoned by edict to appear within thirty days, in default of which proceedings would be had against him *in absentia*. On the 13th this edict was ready and on the 14th it was posted in the churches and was distributed throughout the land with all possible speed. It is a singular medley of politics and religion, illustrating the duplicate character of the Inquisition of the period and the enormous advantage to the government of possessing control over the ecclesiastical establishment, whereby an attack on the civil power could be made to assume the appearance of an assault on the faith. All the heretical utterances, discredited nine years before by the action of the tribunal, are put forward as absolute facts. It is impiety that has led him to raise the banner of revolt, and to seduce numbers of unhappy dupes to follow him. In the inability to reach him personally he is summoned, under pain of excommunication, to appear for trial within thirty days, as otherwise he will be prosecuted *in rebeldia*, to definitive sentence and burning in effigy if necessary. All those who support him or have converse with him, and all those who do not inform against his revolutionary projects, are declared guilty of the crime of fautorship of heresy and subject to the penalties decreed for it by the canons. When to this are added the proclamations of excommunication issued against the insurgents by the Archbishop of Mexico and the bishops of the disturbed districts, it will be seen how powerful was the restraining influence exercised by the Church over a population trained to obedience and how fierce were the passions which braved its anathemas.[1]

In fact, the hatred of the creoles and of the Indians for the *Gachupines*, or Spaniards, was so bitter that four-fifths of the native clergy took the side of the insurgents in spite of the censures of the Church and questions of faith became inextricably involved in the conflict between the factions. To the loyalists Hidalgo became a heretic, and indeed a heresiarch, and the confessional was so largely used to sustain their cause that in self-defence the insurgents incurred the charge of a new heresy by asserting that confession to a Gachupin priest was invalid. They derived great comfort, moreover, through their belief in the protection of Our Lady of Guadalupe, who was universally revered, and especially by the Indians, as the sovereign patroness of Mexico. On the fateful 16th of September, when Hidalgo was marching on San Miguel el Grande at the head of his little band of insurgents, in passing through Atolonila he chanced to take an image on linen of the Guadalupe Virgin and give it to one of his men to carry as a banner. It was adopted by the other bands as they rose and it became the standard of the insurrection, usually accompanied with an image of Ferdinand VII. and of the eagle of Mexico and the inscription "Viva Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe! Viva Fernando VII.! Viva la América y muere el mal gobierno!" To stimulate her intervention, Hidalgo issued a proclamation, just before the disastrous day of the Bridge of Calderon, in which he ordered a novena of masses dedicated to our lady of Guadalupe, "as the sworn Maecenas of all the American nation." Second in rank as a tutelary power of the insurrection was Our Lady of Puebla, and against these the loyalists pitted a new-comer, Our Lady of Los Remedios, who was denounced as a Gachupina by the natives. It was as though there were three Homeric divinities presiding over and participating in the struggle.[1]

---

[1] These comprehensive excommunications led to a result not wholly creditable to the Church. A writer in 1822 calls attention to the fact that while the leading insurgents who were captured were formally reconciled to the Church before they were shot, the mass of the people never paid attention to the censures and were finally received to the sacraments without having been absolved. *El Sol*, Mexico, February 27, 1822, p. 107.

The Inquisition labored earnestly to get evidence of sacrilegious acts committed by the insurgents and, as they were beaten back, it had its emissaries in the territories abandoned by them collecting testimony as to individuals who had sympathized with the revolt or had opposed the posting of the edict. The most active of these was Fray Simon de la Mora, who accompanied the royal army in its advance. He reported that it was useless to attempt to enumerate the common people, but he sent the names of fifty-nine persons of standing, many of them ecclesiastics, with the evidence against them, and the notes on the margin of the record show that their names were forthwith entered for prosecution.

The edict was duly posted in the towns occupied by the army, but in the course of a night or two it was generally torn down or rendered illegible with paint, in spite of the heavy penalties for thus impeding the Inquisition. Hidalgo felt it necessary to issue a manifesto in his defence, protesting that he had never departed from the faith, and pointing out the contradictory character of the miscellaneous heresies imputed to him. To this the Inquisition replied with another edict, January 26, 1811, reiterating its charges against him, stigmatizing him as a cruel atheist, and prohibiting sundry proclamations issued by the insurgents.[2]

Meanwhile the trial of Hidalgo *in absentia* was proceeding through its several stages as elaborately and deliberately as though he were a common heretic in time of peace. On November 24, 1810, the tribunal declared that, as it had evidence that Hidalgo on October 27 was acquainted with the edict, the thirty days' term should run from October 28. On November 28, accordingly, the fiscal demanded that he should be treated as *rebelde* or contumacious, and that ten days, as usual, should be given to him to appear in person. The three terms of ten days each with two days additional were scrupulously observed. Then further delay followed and it was not until February 7, 1811, that the formal trial began with the presentation of the accusation by the fiscal. This was in the ordinary form, reciting that Hidalgo was a Christian, baptized and confirmed, and as such enjoying the privileges and exemptions accorded to good Catholics, "yet had he left the bosom of the Holy Church for the filthy, impure and abominable faith of the heretical Gnostics, Sergius, Berengar, Cerinthus, Carpocrates, Nestorius, Marcion, Socinus, the Ebionites, Lutherans, Calvinists and other pestilent writers, Deists, Materialists and Atheists, whose works he had read and endeavored to revive and persuade his sect to adopt their errors and heresies, believing wrongly, like them, as to various articles and dogmas of our holy religion, and revolutionizing the whole bishoprics of Valladolid and Guadalajara and great part of the archdiocese of Mexico, being, moreover, the chief cause of the great abominations and sins which have been and still are committed. All this and more which I shall set forth constitute him a formal heretic, apostate from our holy faith, an atheist, materialist and deist, a libertine, seditious, schismatic, Judaizer, Lutheran and Calvinist, guilty of divine and human high treason, a blasphemer, an implacable enemy of Christianity and the state, a wicked seducer, lascivious, a hypocrite, a cunning traitor to king and country, pertinacious, contumacious and rebellious to the Holy Office, of all of which I accuse him in general and in particular." The fiscal then proceeds to recite the evidence taken since 1800, together with a long statement of the culprit's share in the insurrection, winding up by asking that without requiring further proof he shall be condemned to confiscation and relaxation (the euphemistic term for burning) in person, if he can be had, and if not then in effigy, or if the evidence be insufficient, that he be tortured if his person can be had.

---

[1] The following madrigal, composed by an ecclesiastic of San Miguel el Grande and very popular with the insurgents, shows how they identified their cause with that of religion.

"Quien es tu perfecta guia?
Maria.
Quien reina en tu corazon?
Su religion.
Quien su causa defiende?
Allende.
Pues mira, escucha y atiende
Que el valor es lo que importa,
Pues por eso te exhorta
María, religion y Allende."

[2] One of these proclamations shows the savage character of the insurgent warfare. It sets forth the conditions of the struggle, of which the following will suffice.

4. The European who resists with arms will be put to the sword.

5. When threatened with siege or battle, before commencing we will put to the sword the numerous Europeans in our hands, and will then abide the fortune of war.

6. The American who defends a European with arms will be put to the sword.

Thus was justified in advance the execution of Hidalgo and other chiefs, and the characteristic cruelty of the strife was equally shared.

The inquisitors received the accusation and gravely ordered a copy to be given to Hidalgo, according to routine; then, in view of his contumacious absence, due notification was made in the halls and proper record was taken of it. After the usual interval of ten days and two days, on February 19, the fiscal accused the contumacy of the absent and fugitive Hidalgo in not answering the accusation and asked that the case be concluded and received to proof.

The inquisitors assented and the proof was presented. Then another interval occurred, until May 20, when the fiscal called for the publication of witnesses, which was duly ordered to be made with the ordinary suppression of their names. Of this publication a large portion consisted of evidence taken during the insurrection, showing acts of sacrilege, contempt for the Inquisition and its edicts and the like, on the part of Hidalgo and his followers. If was ordered that a copy of this be given to him and that he answer it in the next audience, of which announcement was made in the halls and duly recorded. It was not until June 14 that the next step was taken in ordering that a copy of both accusation and publication be given to him and that by the third day he put in his answer with the assent of his advocate—an advocate being appointed for him in the person of the licenciate José Maria Rosas. Then another witness was found in the priest García de Carrasqueda, a prisoner on trial, to whom allusion has been made above. His evidence was taken, June 21, and on the 27th was submitted to *calificadores* who, on August 12, presented a long and learnedly argumentative report, in which they characterized the several propositions attributed to Hidalgo with the customary selection of objurgatory epithets as *falsa, impia, temeraria, injuriosa, proxima á error, escandalosa, ofensiva de piadosos oidos, blasfema, malsonante, sapiens haeresim, llena de escandalo, erronea, sapiens errorem Lutheranorum, Judaica y formalmente herética, injuriosa al espiritu de la S. M. Iglesia,* and they concluded that if he who uttered them did so with full knowledge of their import, he was a formal heretic.

This was practically the last act of the long-drawn-out comedy, although some additional testimony concerning Hidalgo was taken, February 10 and 20, 1812, in the trial of that habitual liar Fray Manuel Estrada, who had fallen into the clutches of the Holy Office. Events had moved faster than the Inquisition. On March 21, 1811, Hidalgo had been captured at Bajan, whence he was carried two hundred leagues further off to Chihuahua, where he was executed July 31, while the *calificadores* were still busy in formulating his heresies. No notice of this was given to the Inquisition, which was treated with singular discourtesy, savoring of contempt. The explanation of this probably is that if the Holy Office had been apprised of the capture it could rightly have claimed the prisoner as a heretic primarily subject to its supreme and exclusive jurisdiction; there might have been danger in escorting him back through the recently disturbed provinces; the processes of the Inquisition were notoriously slow and after it had tried the culprit and penanced him in an *auto* he would still have to be condemned by a military court. It was in every way more politic to despatch him in far-off Chihuahua, and the local military and ecclesiastical authorities co-operated to this result, leaving the Inquisition to find out what it could and not even forwarding a supplication which Hidalgo had addressed to it on June 10.

The Holy Office waited patiently for eleven months after the catastrophe and then, on June 25, 1812, it wrote with much solemnity to its two commissioners in Chihuahua, reminding them that the edict of October 10, 1810, rendered it their duty to keep the tribunal advised of the capture of Hidalgo and of all subsequent occurrences. They should have gone to him in prison and exhorted him to make a declaration on all points connected with the edict and whatever else weighed upon his conscience. All signs of repentance should have been observed and reported, and at least his confession to his judges, in so far as the Inquisition was concerned, should have been sent to it. The alcaide, the ecclesiastics and the military officers must now be examined as to his state of mind during his imprisonment, so that the tribunal may know about his repentance or impenitence and be enabled to render justice. The two commissioners are to work in harmony, with power of subdelegation, and they are made responsible, before God and the King, for the discharge of their duty.

The Holy Office evidently took itself seriously and held that the judgment as to Hidalgo's heresies still lay in its hands. There must have been a flush of indignation and wounded pride when, on January 2, 1813, the inquisitors received an answer from Sanchez Alvarez, one of the commissioners, dated October 27, 1812, reporting that he had applied to Nemesio Salcedo, the commandant-general, who had ordered him to suspend all action and that he, Salcedo, would explain the absolute necessity of this. The tribunal had to wait till February 27th before it received Salcedo's explanation, dated October 22, showing how its supreme jurisdiction in matters of heresy had been overslaughed with as little ceremony as that of a pie-powder court. With profuse expressions of respect Salcedo stated that the peace and prosperity of the provinces required that the matter should not be agitated. Hidalgo was not a heretic and would not have been permitted to receive the sacraments and ecclesiastical burial had he not been duly absolved and reconciled to the Church. A royal order, he said, of May 12, 1810,[1] had conveyed papal inquisitorial faculties to the bishops and the Bishop of Durango had subdelegated the doctrinal canon of his church, Doctor Francisco Fernandez Valentin, thus constituting him a papal inquisitor. As such, to him were communicated the answers of Hidalgo on his trial, who ratified them in his presence; he also verified the manifesto of Hidalgo, which was published, and he absolved him. He also saw the supplication of Hidalgo to the Inquisition, which would have been forwarded sooner, but for the risk of its being intercepted. It was now enclosed, together with the other necessary papers. Accompanying this letter were extracts from Hidalgo's examinations, his manifesto to the insurgents and supplication to the Inquisition.

---

[1] In weighing the truthfulness of this statement it is to be borne in mind that at this date both Ferdinand VII. and Pius VII. were prisoners of Napoleon.

It was somewhat brutal to have kept the tribunal so long in the dark, on a matter concerning its highest privilege, and to have detained, for sixteen months, on a frivolous pretext, a supplication addressed directly to it; but its position was precarious and it did not dare to complain. In Spain Napoleon had abolished the Inquisition, in so far as he could, in 1808, and in the national Córtes of Cadiz a discussion was then on foot which, on February 12, 1813, reached a similar result. The news of this, however, had not yet reached Mexico when the tribunal on March 13th took action on these papers. It evidently placed no faith in the story of a papal inquisitor suddenly created in the wilds of Chihuahua, for it wholly ignored his action. The fiscal reported to the tribunal that in spite of Hidalgo's supplication for pardon and endeavors to satisfy the charges against him, there were not merits enough to absolve his memory and fame nor, at the same time, to condemn him, as it appeared that he had made a general confession and had been reconciled. Thereupon the tribunal ordered the papers to be filed in the proper place and the case to be suspended—an expression of dissatisfaction and a confession of powerlessness. On March 29th, it acknowledged Salcedo's letter and drily thanked him.

Hidalgo's supplication to the Inquisition, dated from his prison, June 10, 1811, is a long and dignified declaration of submission, calmly and clearly reasoned and manifesting complete command of his theological learning. But for his confinement, he said, he would hasten to throw himself at the feet of the tribunal, not only to seek pardon for his insubordination but to vindicate himself from the charge of heresy and apostasy which was insufferable to him. He answered the various accusations of the edict, denying that he had led an immoral life and exculpating himself with much dexterity from the heresies imputed to him; but if, he added, the Inquisition deemed his utterances heretical, though he had not hitherto so considered them, he now retracted, abjured and detested them. He concluded by begging to be relieved from the disgrace of heresy and apostasy; the tribunal could repose entire faith in his statements for, if he had committed those crimes, the position in which he now found himself would impel him to confess them freely in order to gain the pardon and absolution that would open to him the gates of heaven and would close them if withheld through his denial.[1] It is evident that when writing this appeal he had no knowledge of a papal inquisitor close at hand empowered to remove the excommunication, which could be done only by the authority which had imposed it.

The frame of mind revealed in this document, which is unquestionably genuine, serves to refute the imputation of forgery so generally ascribed to Hidalgo's manifesto of May 18, addressed "A Todo el Mundo" and published in order to quiet the population. Its effusiveness and extravagance of repentance and the earnestness of its exhortation to his followers to submit have not unnaturally created suspicion from their violent contrast to the deep convictions and reckless energy with which he precipitated and sustained the insurrection, but it can be accepted as authentic without questioning his good faith. He was impulsive and enthusiastic and liable to the revulsions incident to his temperament. His cause had been disowned by God; he had been captured as a fugitive within a few months after he had been at the head of eighty thousand men. The grave was yawning for him as the portal to the hereafter in which there was, in his belief, no escape from eternal torment for one who had died as a rebel to the Church. He was a fervent Catholic whose excommunication cut him off from the sacraments essential to salvation unless he could prove himself worthy of them by earnest repentance and by the amendment which could be manifested only through zeal in undoing that which had brought upon him the anathema. That under such pressure he should seek to avert the endless doom by heart-felt contrition was natural, however strange it may seem to those brought up in a different faith, who can sympathize with his aspirations for liberty but cannot realize the ties which enchained him to his religious convictions.

Although the extinction of the Inquisition by the decree of the córtes of Cadiz was operative in Mexico for but little more than a year, when the tribunal resumed its functions in January, 1815, it had naturally been weakened by the suspension. But one inquisitor, Manuel de Flores had stuck to his post, and he endeavored to demonstrate his political usefulness by an edict of July 8, 1815, condemning and prohibiting various proclamations of the insurgents, including their constitution of November 22, 1814, which was largely modelled on that of Cadiz in 1812.

---

[1] A V. S. reverentemente suplico reciba esta mi solicitud, haga de ella el uso que sea de su superior beneplacito, concediendome el honor que sera para mi mui apreceable de borrarme, la nota de herege y apostata de nuestra santa religion, creyendo sin temor alguno cuanto he espuesto a V. S. pues las circonstancias en que me hallo me harian confesar ingenuamente esas crímenes si los habia cometido, para alcanzar el perdon y absoluciones que debean franquearme las puertas del cielo y que me les cerrarian si por negarlos no se me dieran.

The capture, November 5, 1815, of the insurgent chief Morelos afforded Flores an opportunity, of which he eagerly availed himself, of bringing his discredited tribunal prominently into public notice. José María Morelos shares with Hidalgo the foremost place in the Mexican Valhalla. Born in 1764 of humble parents, he was an agricultural laborer from the age of fourteen to that of twenty-five, when he returned to his native Valladolid and applied himself to the study of grammar, philosophy and morals. Entering the Church, he took full orders and after serving temporarily the cure of Choromuco he obtained that of Caraguaro, which was under the rectorship of Hidalgo. It must have been a slender benefice, for on his trial he explained his not having the indulgence of the Santa Cruzada by the plea that before the insurrection he was too poor to pay for it, and afterward the insurgents regarded it as merely a device for raising money to carry on the war against them. His morals were those of his class: he admitted having three children, born of different mothers during his priesthood, but he added that his habits, although not edifying, had not been scandalous, and the tribunal seemed to think so, for little attention was paid to this during his trial and in the *calificacion* which preceded his sentence it is not even alluded to. He joined Hidalgo, October 28, 1810, and must have quickly distinguished himself, for that chief gave him a commission to raise the Pacific coast provinces and after his death the burden of maintaining the unequal contest fell mainly on Morelos, who was raised successively to the grades of lieutenant-governor and captain-general with the official title of Most Serene Highness.

Unlike Hidalgo, who was hurried off to Chihuahua, Morelos was brought to the city of Mexico for trial and execution, arriving there on November 21. He was carried to the Inquisition, not as its prisoner but "on deposit," and Flores, to preserve the secrecy of the Holy Office, stipulated that the guard accompanying him should not go up stairs or penetrate beyond the first court-yard, and it was not until 1:30 A. M. of the 22nd that he was immured in the secret prisons, in a cell so dark that he could not read the breviary which was given him on his request. The 22nd was occupied with an effort to obtain permission to try him—a *competencia,* or struggle for jurisdiction, carried on in a very different spirit from the masterful audacity which aforetime in these frequent contests had enabled the Inquisition to triumph over the royal and spiritual courts. The viceroy Calleja desired that Morelos should be degraded from the priesthood within three days by the episcopal jurisdiction in order that his execution should be prompt, and testimony for that purpose was already being taken by the secular and spiritual courts acting in unison. Flores, therefore, had no time to lose in putting forward the claim of his tribunal, and the fiscal drew up an elaborate paper showing that there were points in the case which came within its jurisdiction. On the 23d a *consulta* was assembled consisting of the episcopal Ordinary of Valladolid and the *consultores* of the Inquisition, which represented to the viceroy that, although Morelos was subject to both the secular and spiritual courts, they were persuaded that for other crimes he was justiciable by the Inquisition and that his trial by that tribunal would redound to the honor and glory of God as well as to the service of the King and the state and be efficacious in undeceiving the rebels. Moreover, it promised that the trial should be concluded within four days. Somewhat unwillingly Calleja granted the request and no time was lost in commencing the most expeditious trial in the annals of the Holy Office—a grim comedy to gratify the vanity of the actors, for it could have no influence on the fate of the prisoner save in so far as the Inquisition alone could absolve him from its excommunications under which he inferentially lay. Flores, in boasting of the activity displayed, adds that they were much embarrassed by Morelos being frequently taken from them for examination in the other courts, which proves that the authorities regarded the Inquisition as merely a side-show.

Hurried as were the proceedings all the formalities required by the cumbrous methods of the Holy Office were duly observed. That same day, November 23, the fiscal presented his *clamosa,* basing it on Morelos having signed the constitutional decree of November 22, 1814, as well as various proclamations condemned as heretical by the Inquisition; also on his celebrating mass when under excommunication and his reply to the Bishop of Puebla, when reproached for so doing, that it would be easier to get a dispensation after the war than to survive the guillotine; also an edict of the Bishop of Valladolid, July 22, 1814, declaring him to be an excommunicated heretic. There was still time for a morning audience and the prisoner was brought before the tribunal where he was subjected to the customary examination as to his genealogy and whole career and the first monition was given adjuring him for the love of God and the Virgin to save his soul by confessing the truth. In the afternoon he had his second audience and second monition. On the morning of the 24th the third monition was given in the third audience, in which he admitted that at Teypan he had captured a package of the edicts against Hidalgo and had used them to make cartridges. The pompous formulas urging him to discharge his conscience in order that the Inquisition might show him its customary mercy must have seemed a ghastly jest to a man who knew that his captors would speedily shoot him, and they contrast somewhat ludicrously with the feverish anxiety of the inquisitor to have a hand in the performance.

That same afternoon the fiscal presented the accusation and, considering the brief time allowed for its preparation, its long accumulation of rhetoric is creditable to the industry of the draughtsman. He describes Morelos as abandoning the Church for the filthy and abominable heresies of Hobbes, Helvetius, Voltaire, Luther and other pestilent writers, rendering him a formal heretic, an apostate from the holy faith, an atheist, materialist, deist, libertine, seditious, guilty of divine and human high treason, an implacable enemy of Christianity and the state, a vile seducer, a hypocrite, a traitor to king and country, cunning, lascivious, pertinacious and rebellious to the Holy Office. He shows how rebellion is heresy and all rebellious acts are directly or indirectly heretical. To Morelos, in the bottom of his heart, Christ and Belial are equal and he is even suspect of toleration. As usual, the accusation concludes by asking for confiscation and relaxation. The remainder of the afternoon and the morning audience of the 25th were occupied with the defendant's answers to the twenty-four articles of the accusation. From what he said it appears that the insurgents claimed to be opposing the French domination in Spain, and that Ferdinand's restoration in 1814 was largely disbelieved or was assumed to be only another phase of Napoleon's supremacy, showing that Ferdinand could not be a sincere Catholic.

That same morning the publication of witnesses was made, consisting wholly of documents, such as the constitution of October 22, 1814, sundry proclamations signed by Morelos and his printed letter to the Bishop of Puebla together with the letter of the Bishop of Valladolid declaring him to be an excommunicated heretic. This was the whole case against him, but it was sufficient. He was ordered to answer with the advice of his counsel and the three advocates of prisoners were named to him, of whom he selected Don José Maria Gutierrez de Rosas—apparently the same one who had appeared for Hidalgo. He was sent to his cell to be brought back directly afterwards for an interview with his counsel, who was sworn in as was customary. There was no time to make copies of the papers, so the unusual course was adopted of entrusting the originals to Rosas with instructions to return them and present the defence within three hours. In the afternoon he did so, and in view of the haste required of him he must have been a ready writer, but he was more occupied in defending himself for undertaking the case than in making a plea for his client. He savagely denounced the insurrection and the córtes of Cadiz whose principles it represented, and he concluded abruptly with a few lines alleging the repentance of Morelos from which he hoped for absolution. The inquisitor thereupon ordered the fiscal to be notified and the case to be definitely concluded.

The next morning, November 26, Flores assembled his *calificadores* and exhibited to them the proceedings and the condemnations of the insurgent constitution and proclamations. One of the assistants, Fray Domingo Barreda, opined that the accused savored of heresy, but the rest unanimously agreed that he was a formal heretic who denied his guilt and was not only suspect of atheism but an atheist outright. In the afternoon was held the *consulta de fe* to decide his sentence. Without a dissenting voice it agreed that a public *auto de fe* should be held in the audience-chamber the next morning at eight o'clock, in presence of the officials of the Inquisition and of a hundred prominent persons to be designated by Flores; that Morelos should then be declared guilty of malicious and pertinacious imperfect confession, a formal heretic who denied his guilt, a disturber and persecutor of the hierarchy and a profaner of the sacraments; that he was guilty of high treason human and divine, pontifical and royal, and that he be present at the mass in the guise of a penitent, in short cassock without collar or girdle and holding a green candle which, as a heretic and fautor of heretics, he should offer to the priest. As a cruel persecutor of the Holy Office his property should be confiscated to the King. Although deserving of degradation and relaxation for the crimes subject to the Inquisition, yet, as he was ready to abjure, he was, in the unlikely case of the viceroy sparing his life, condemned to perpetual banishment from America and from all royal residences and to imprisonment for life in one of the African presidios, with deprivation of all ecclesiastical benefices and perpetual irregularity. His three children were declared subject to infamy and to the legal disabilities imposed on the descendants of heretics. He was to abjure formally and be absolved from the excommunications reserved to the Holy

Office, he was to make a general confession and through life to recite the seven penitential psalms on Fridays and a part of the rosary on Saturdays. Moreover, a tablet, inscribed with his name and offences, suspended in the cathedral, was to carry to posterity the memory of his misdeeds.

This prostitution of religion in the service of politics was carried out to the end. The next morning, November 27, as Flores reports, the *auto* was duly celebrated in the most imposing scene ever witnessed in the audience-chamber, which was crowded with five hundred of the most important personages of the capital. The mass was followed by the terrible ceremony of degradation from the priesthood, performed by the Bishop of Oaxaca; Morelos was delivered to the royal judge and returned to the secret prisons, whence, at 1:30 A. M. of the following night, he was transferred to the citadel. Flores might proudly claim to have vindicated the jurisdiction of the Holy Office, though at some sacrifice of its dignity, in the shortest trial of a formal heretic to be found in its records, but the object of the indecent haste required by Calleja is not apparent, for Morelos was not executed until December 22.

This trial may be said to mark the close of the active career of the Mexican Inquisition, for although it was not abolished until 1820, and although it continued to molest and persecute aspirants for liberty, there is no trace of its having subsequently celebrated an *auto de fe*.

Henry Charles Lea.

JOHN BELL OF TENNESSEE

A CHAPTER OF POLITICAL HISTORY

A TENNESSEE lawyer wittily says that Tennessee "broke into the Union." The "Territory of the United States South of the River Ohio" was established by an act of Congress passed May 26, 1790. By this act the newly created territory, which geographically was almost identical with the present state of Tennessee, was to be governed in all respects as the Northwest Territory, except that slavery was to be permitted. This last had been provided for in the act of cession, by which North Carolina had conveyed the greater part of the territory to the United States.

The new territory was entitled to become a state whenever the population should amount to 60,000. The census properly should have been ordered by Congress and taken under Federal supervision, but the legislature of the territory, in ignorance or in disregard of this fact, passed an act July 11, 1795, for the enumeration of the people. The population was found to exceed seventy-seven thousand. Thereupon a convention was called, and met at Knoxville, January 11, 1796. By the sixth of February it had completed its labors, having reproduced, with certain democratic changes, the constitution of North Carolina of 1776. Mr. Jefferson said of this Tennessee constitution, "that it was the least imperfect and the most republican" of the state constitutions.

The new applicant for statehood did not waste time, but in March, 1796, assembled its first legislature, and prematurely elected two senators. On the 8th of April the constitution was presented to Congress. After some debate the House of Representatives passed a bill admitting Tennessee into the Union, but in the Senate the most serious opposition was encountered. The active championship of Aaron Burr was one of the principal means of securing the passage of the bill. The Federalists opposed it as a measure in aid of Mr. Jefferson's ambition to become President. The bill was approved by the President on the first day of June, 1796.

It thus appears that the Federalist leaders regarded Tennessee as certain to become a Republican state. In this they were right, and their course in opposing her admission to the Union had the effect of confirming her Republicanism. The people were indignant on account of the opposition, and for many years no public man in Tennessee dared to admit that he entertained Federalist principles. It was not until 1823 that there was a sign of revolt from the Democratic-Republican party in the state, and even then the demonstration was not serious, and for twelve years later there was no real party division in Tennessee. The Whig party had its birth in Tennessee in the year 1835, although four years elapsed before the name was openly adopted.

In 1823 John Williams,[1] who was United States senator from Tennessee, sought re-election. He had been a colonel in the regular army, and had led his regiment with conspicuous valor in the battle of the Horse-shoe. As a senator, his services had been acceptable and everything indicated his re-election. But Andrew Jackson was a candidate for the presidency and his supporters demanded pledges from Williams, who declined to give them and avowed his preference for a rival candidate. The Jackson men, failing to find any other candidate who could defeat him, brought forward their distinguished leader, and elected him, but not without vigorous opposition. Among the members of the legislature who voted for Williams against Jackson was David Crockett. In 1825 and again in 1833, Crockett was elected to Congress. During both terms he was outspoken in opposition to Jackson and in the last one declared himself a Whig, being probably the first man of note in the state to assume the name openly. From the year 1815 till his death, Andrew Jackson was the foremost man in Tennessee. Failing of election to the presidency in 1824 he was elected in 1828, securing the support of New York, through the political skill and the energy of Martin Van Buren. Next to Jackson in distinction and popularity among the public men of Tennessee at this period was Hugh Lawson White, a man of great ability, of unsullied purity, and much force of character. He had been for years Jackson's intimate friend and his wisest and most capable adviser. About the beginning of Jackson's second term, White began to be spoken of as a probable successor. Jackson had determined that Van Buren should succeed him, and left nothing undone to secure that end. White was offered the most honorable offices in order to prevent his candidacy for the presidency, but declined them all. Finally Jackson, according to his custom, yielded to his temper and declared that if White became a candidate he would be made odious to society. In December, 1834, a majority of the Tennessee delegation in Congress joined in a letter to White asking him to declare himself a candidate. Justly incensed

[1] John Williams was a great-grandfather of Naval Constructor Richmond P. Hobson.

against Jackson, he instantly consented, and among his supporters at this time was John Bell, who was destined to be the leader of the Whig party, in Tennessee, throughout its existence.

These preliminary statements are necessary to a clear understanding of Bell's career. He was a native of Tennessee, and was born near Nashville, February 15, 1797. His father, Samuel Bell, was one of the pioneers of Tennessee. His mother, whose maiden name was Margaret Edmiston, was a native of Virginia, descended from a worthy Scotch-Irish ancestry. Her father, Samuel Edmiston, was with Shelby at the battle of King's Mountain, and the musket which he carried on that memorable day is preserved in the rooms of the Tennessee Historical Society at Nashville.

John Bell was educated at the University of Nashville, graduating in 1814. Three years later, when he had barely attained his majority, he was elected to the state senate. Realizing promptly, however, that he had made a mistake in entering politics so early in life, he declined a re-election, and removing to Nashville, devoted the next ten years to the study and the practice of law, and to careful general reading. The bar of Nashville was a strong one, but Bell rose rapidly, and the most competent judges declare that he was exceptionally qualified for the profession. The cast of his mind was philosophic and judicial, but he preferred the large affairs of state to the incessant contests and the drudgery of the law. That he looked forward, from the first, to a career in public life, is not to be doubted.

In 1827, he believed that the time had arrived when he might enter with safety upon this career. The Nashville district contained many strong men, but, with the exception of Andrew Jackson, none better known or more popular, at that time, than Felix Grundy. In Kentucky, where he had been reared, Grundy had been chief-justice of the highest court of that state In the legislature of Kentucky he had shown himself no unworthy rival of Henry Clay as an orator and as a debater. In Tennessee, whither he moved in 1807, he had been elected to Congress with practical unanimity in 1811, and re-elected in 1813, but had resigned. While in Congress he had exerted an unsurpassed influence. He had been one of the most vigorous advocates of the War of 1812, and the Federalists were fond of attributing that war to the firm of "Madison, Grundy and the Devil."

In 1827, Mr. Grundy again sought to represent the Nashville district in Congress. Andrew Jackson was his outspoken and active supporter, and at that time the influence of Jackson in Tennessee was believed to be irresistible. It caused the most profound astonishment therefore, when Grundy, the man next to Jackson in popular fame and admiration, in the district, was defeated by John Bell, then a comparatively unknown man; and the new congressman continued for fourteen years to represent the Nashville district.

At first there was no open breach between him and Jackson, but Bell never forgot the contest of 1827, and Jackson's course at that time was destined to influence profoundly the later political history of the state and of the Union. It was the beginning of the estrangement of the two men who played the most important parts in public life in Tennessee, during the three decades preceding the Civil War. Despite the fact that Mr. Bell's temperament and habits of mind were in a measure unsuited to the noisy and sometimes tempestuous proceedings of the House of Representatives, he speedily rose to a position of leadership. Among the Tennesseeans he was easily the most accomplished and effective debater. He was not a frequent speaker, but when he arose was heard always with respect and attention. He had many of the physical gifts and graces of the orator, together with an exceptional command of language, and was a clear, logical and persuasive reasoner.

Twice he seemed on the brink of a broader career; but was both times disappointed. In 1834 he was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives, but in 1835 was defeated for that office by James K. Polk of his own state. In 1841 he entered President Harrison's cabinet as Secretary of War, but resigned after the death of the President and the political defection of his successor. He might at this time, or at least in 1843, have been elected to the Senate, but preferred for the time to remain in private life.

Meanwhile events of great importance to him and to the country led, or rather drove him, to a radical change of position. In every Congressional election, after 1827, the friends of Jackson had manifested a bitter opposition to Bell, but all their efforts to defeat him had been futile. The estrangement between Jackson and Bell, begun in 1827, was more and more confirmed every year by this persistent antagonizing of Bell by the President's friends.

As early as 1831, Jackson's determination to make Van Buren his successor was becoming widely known, though Tennessee and other states preferred White, and Crockett, again in Congress, was bold in opposing Jackson. The seeds sown in the fight against Williams in 1823 were bearing fruit; and in 1835 the time was ripe for political revolution in Tennessee. White's candidacy for the presidency was a declaration of independence and also a declaration of war. Tennessee was strongly for White and profoundly distrustful of Van Buren. Bell became the leader of the White forces in that state, not so much because he loved White, although he held him in great esteem, as because he knew that his own political life and the political future of the state were involved in the struggle.

Up to this time Bell had never placed himself distinctly in opposition to Jackson, or to his party. It is true that he had disapproved the removal of the bank deposits, but he had supported Jackson in the nullification troubles, and had been in accord with the administration upon the subject of the tariff. Even in 1835 he was not ready to leave the Democratic-Republican party, or to admit that the differences between the President and himself were more than personal. Upon the contrary he declared that the friends of White would adhere to Jackson, but from a desire to be consistent, and out of respect for their own characters and in support of their own principles. But events were irresistible; no sooner had White become a candidate, than a furious factional war began. The *Globe*, the Jackson organ at Washington, declared that White was being used by Bell to break down the administration. The President declared that Bell must not be returned to Congress; but no one could be found to run against him, and he was re-elected. The press of the state favored White, and therefore one Jeremiah George Harris, a native of New England, a trained writer, with a gift of satire and vituperation, devoted to Jackson and Van Buren and versed in political methods, was brought to Tennessee and placed in charge of a newspaper to ridicule and abuse Bell and White. In 1835, White was returned to the Senate. In the state election of that year, the White candidate for governor was elected, and everything indicated that the state would go for White in the Federal election.

Jackson, as usual, fought with all his strength, willingly enduring the hardships of the long journey from Washington to Tennessee in order to engage in personal advocacy of his candidate, maintaining, however, that the issue was solely between White and himself. But his efforts were of no avail. White carried the state and even secured a majority in the Hermitage precinct. Jackson and his supporters in this campaign denounced Bell and White and their friends as Whigs, as "new Whigs," and by this last opprobrious name they were long known. The reluctance with which men admit a change of political position was never more strikingly shown than in Tennessee at this period. The proscriptions of the Jacksonians had alienated many prominent men and caused much discontent among the people; in Tennessee, as elsewhere, there were differences of opinion upon public questions, but the sentiment existing before Tennessee became a state and confirmed by the opposition to her admission, had up to this time been too strong to be resisted, and the leaders of the dominant party had been men of extraordinary ability and force.

It was not until 1839 that the opponents of Jackson reached the point where they were willing to call themselves Whigs. White refused to the last to adopt the name, but called himself an independent. Newton Cannon, a candidate for governor in 1839, was the first avowed Whig candidate for that office in Tennessee. But the strength of the Whigs, or of the opponents of Jackson, in the state is shown by the fact that in 1840 Harrison carried Tennessee by a majority of 12,000 votes in a total of a little over 100,000. In 1841 and again in 1843, James C. Jones, the Whig candidate for governor, defeated so conspicuous and important a Democrat as James K. Polk.

In 1844, Mr. Polk, although elected President, was unable to carry his own state, and in 1848 and in 1852, the Whig candidates received the electoral vote of Tennessee. In every presidential election from 1796 to 1832, inclusive, Tennessee gave her vote to the Democratic-Republican candidate. In 1824 John Quincy Adams received only 216 votes in the state, and in 1828 only 2,240. In 1832 Mr. Clay's vote was 1,436 and Jackson's 28,740. These figures compared with the vote in 1836 show, first, the strength of the Democratic party, and the utter want of opposition to it, and, second, that there was a large stay-at-home vote in the state which must have been in some measure disaffected. For in 1836 Van Buren received 26,120 votes, only 2,000 less than had been cast for Jackson four years before, while the aggregate opposition vote was almost 36,000. Making the largest allowance for the increase of population in the interval between the two elections, it is still certain that almost half the voters had been neglecting to vote, and that many of them were not Democrats, or at least not Jacksonians in sentiment. Crockett, Williams, White and Bell led the way to overthrow of the Democrats. Crockett was unable to return to Congress after 1835, Williams died in 1837, and White in 1840, and Bell became, as he was entitled to be, the leader of the Whig party in Tennessee, and held that position without dispute until the dissolution of the party. Thus the first manifestation of serious opposition to Jackson in Tennessee was in 1835; the first contest in which the party name Whig was openly adopted was in 1839, and the last distinctively Whig victory in 1852. The election of 1860 will be considered later.

Tennessee, the second in age among the southwestern states, was from 1825 to 1860 the first in political importance and influence, by reason of her population and wealth, by reason of the ability of her public men, and not a little because Andrew Jackson was a citizen of the state. It was in the early part of this period that the West asserted itself, and that the new Democratic influences which wrested the government permanently from the Federalists made themselves felt. Speaking of this time, Woodrow Wilson says: "The inauguration of Jackson brought a new class of men into leadership, and marks the beginning, for good or for ill, of a distinctively American order of politics, begotten of the crude forces of a new nationality. A change of political weather, long preparing, had set in. The new generation which asserted itself in Jackson was not in the least regardful of conservative traditions." In Kentucky the influence of Mr. Clay, always opposed to Jackson, and always conservative, gave a different direction to opinion and conduct.

From 1815 to 1835 the political vocabulary of Tennessee was comprised in the one word Jackson. Admiration and fear alike contributed to Jackson's influence, and never was a public man more ardently or ably supported. Among his lieutenants were John Overton, John Catron, John H. Eaton, Aaron V. Brown, Cave Johnson, Felix Grundy, Hugh L. White and James K. Polk, all men of large ability and in the front rank of Southern leaders. The party thus led was long invincible, and its defeat came at last from over-confidence, and the illiberal and proscriptive policy of its imperative chief. But its overthrow was not easily accomplished. The first serious resistance was made within three years of the time when it had carried the state with practical unanimity. Jackson, the hardest of fighters, was still its leader, and was animated, not only by his native determination and by political prejudices and pride, but also by a bitter personal dislike of the leaders of the opposition. After the defeats of 1835 and 1836, the contest lost nothing of its bitterness. In 1839 the Democrats elected Polk governor and regained control of the legislature. Hugh L. White and Ephraim H. Foster were the senators at the time, and the Jackson leaders determined, if possible, to force them to resign. The opportunity came speedily. Both senators were known to be opposed to the sub-treasury, and both were known to believe that the legislature had the right to instruct senators in Federal affairs. Resolutions were therefore adopted at Nashville, November 8, 1839, instructing White and Foster to vote among other things for the sub-treasury bill. The scheme succeeded. In 1841 the Whigs had a majority, on joint ballot, in the legislature, but the senate being Democratic by one majority, the Democrats in that body, led by

Andrew Johnson, prevented a quorum, with the result that from 1841 to 1843 Tennessee had no senators in Congress. In 1843 the Whigs elected both senators; in 1845 the Democrats succeeded in displacing one of these. In 1847 Mr. Bell was elected and at the close of the term was re-elected, thus serving continuously for twelve years.

No other man in Tennessee, hardly any man in the South, was so well qualified by nature and by training for the duties of senator. Intellectually he was inferior probably to Webster and Calhoun, but to no other men who were in public life in 1847. His mind was large and thoroughly balanced, his temperament was equable and philosophic; he had been a diligent student of the philosophy and history of government, of the law, and of general literature; he was a speaker of rare powers, a graceful and effective rhetorician, and a clear and discriminating thinker. Above all he was an honest man of blameless life, and a sincere patriot.

His time of service in the Senate was one of strife and of incessant commotion and change in the political world. Patriotic expedients had long postponed issue in Congress upon the slavery question, but now conditions imperatively demanded its consideration. Mr. Clay, still devoted to compromise, in 1850 secured the submission of the pending questions of sectional difference to a committee of thirteen selected from both parties, and Bell served with him on this committee.

A bill for the organization of Nebraska was introduced in the session of 1852–1853, but was not disposed of until the following year; to the measure, Bell was strongly opposed, mainly because of the injustice to the Indians that would result from its adoption. In 1854 came the proposition to repeal the Missouri Compromise. The South, upon firm constitutional grounds, but with deplorably mistaken policy, favored the repeal, and Mr. Bell's vote against it provoked anger and widespread criticism in Tennessee. The repeal of the Compromise proved to be in the highest degree prejudicial to the South. When the Lecompton Constitution for Kansas came before Congress, Bell did not hesitate, in advance of its consideration, to declare himself opposed to it. Thereupon the legislature of Tennessee instructed him to vote for it. He declined, however, to be instructed, and voted against the so-called constitution, thereby again incurring the severest censure. But he was right and had the courage to stand to his convictions. In 1859 he retired from the Senate. For seven years he had been practically a man without a party. In 1851, the Whigs had been still strong enough to carry Tennessee for Scott, but it was a barren victory. The Whigs carried only four states, and the party received its death-blow. Bell was returned to the Senate, and thenceforth he and Crittenden of Kentucky represented the Southern Whigs in that body. They were not only the last of the Whig leaders, but the last of the great men of their generation in the Senate.

Bell returned to Tennessee at a time of great uncertainty and anxiety. The political sky was angry and full of threatenings, and forebodings of evil oppressed every patriot heart. Bell loved the Union with a surpassing love, and his every sentiment and every conviction opposed the doctrine and the policy of secession. It is too soon, now, to say that the conduct of many Northern leaders, especially of the more strenuous advocates of abolition, was extreme, and their demands opposed to the Constitution. But Bell and other Union men of the South believed this to be true. These genuine patriots and Unionists were not more opposed to Southern "fire-eaters," of the Yancey type, than to such Northern "fire-eaters" as Garrison and Phillips. They regarded both factions of extremists as alike responsible for the danger that threatened the Union, and it is at least possible that the impartial history which is yet to be written will not charge the Southern leaders with all the unreasonableness and want of patriotism that provoked the Civil War. Bell was prepared to make any personal or political sacrifice to preserve the Union. Another presidential election was at hand. The long-triumphant Democracy was now discordant. The Charleston Convention marked a fatal disruption of the party, and the existence of two irreconcilable factions forbade all hope of success. The Republican party, though young and not yet firmly established, was hopeful and aggressive. There were many worthy men, especially in the South, who would not follow either faction of the Democracy, and who, at the same time, strongly opposed the Republican policy. A convention of these, representing twenty-two states, met in Baltimore, May 9, 1860, and nominated Bell for President and Edward Everett for Vice-President, as the candidates of the "Constitutional Union Party." Bell's principal competitor for the nomination was Sam Houston, of Texas. With much frankness and justice the convention declared that party platforms were insincere, and meant to deceive, and therefore it promulgated none, but contented itself with the adoption of a simple resolution, declaring in favor of the Union, the Constitution and the enforcement of the laws. In the election, Bell and Everett carried the states of Tennessee, Kentucky and Virginia, and received three of the votes of New Jersey.

The six months succeeding the election were full of distress for

Bell and his friends in Tennessee. Isham G. Harris, the governor, a man of great ability and of indomitable will, was now an avowed secessionist. Bell was no less positive in opposition, and at first it seemed that Tennessee would refuse to secede. The vote for Bell and Everett had been 69,274, for Douglas 11,350, for Breckenridge 64,709. Thus the Whigs and the Union Democrats outnumbered the Breckenridge Democrats by fifteen thousand.

On January 7, 1861, the legislature met in special session, and shortly afterward passed a resolution submitting to the people the question of ordering a convention to determine whether or not the state would withdraw from the Union, and also providing for the election of delegates to the convention. The election was held February 8, 1861, and the vote was for the convention, 57,798, against it, 69,675. A better test of public sentiment, however, was the vote for delegates, cast at the same time. The aggregate vote for Union delegates was 88,803, and for disunion delegates 24,749.

This election was accepted as conclusive evidence that Tennessee would not secede, and but for the events of the ensuing spring, she probably would not have seceded. There was no one in the state who was a disunionist for the sake of disunion, not even Governor Harris, but while East Tennessee had but few slaves, Middle and West Tennessee were large slave-holding sections, having interests and sentiments in common with the states that had already seceded.

The attack on Fort Sumter provoked Mr. Lincoln's proclamation of April 15, 1861, calling for volunteers to suppress insurrection, and Governor Harris, when called upon for the state's quota, sent an indignant refusal.

This was the critical time for Bell and his followers, and we shall fail to do justice to the Whig leader without knowledge of his pure character and lofty patriotism; without a genuine sympathy for him personally and a clear perception of conditions in the South at that time. He believed, after the publication of the President's proclamation, that the destruction of the Union was inevitable. He believed, also, that the policy of the administration was unconstitutional and revolutionary. Alexander H. Stephens declares that Mr. Lincoln's proclamations alone caused the Southern Whigs to change position. He says that the Whig leaders of the South regarded these proclamations as the English people regarded the edicts of Charles I. for ship-money.

Three days after the appearance of the proclamation calling for volunteers a number of the most prominent Whigs in Tennessee, led by Mr. Bell, issued an address in which they said, among other things: "Tennessee is called upon by the President to furnish two regiments, and the state has, through her executive, refused to comply with the call. This refusal of our state we fully approve." A later paragraph contains the following: "Should a purpose be developed by the government of over-running and subjugating our brethren of the seceded states, we say unequivocally that it will be the duty of the state to resist at all hazards, and at any cost, and by force of arms, any such purpose or attempt." The address further calls upon the state to arm and to maintain the position of armed neutrality which many Southern Whigs vainly hoped would enable the conservatives to mediate between the North and the South.

This address having been issued, events speedily dictated the result. The South was threatened with invasion. On the 25th of April the legislature again met in special session. The governor in his message boldly advocated secession and an application for admission into the Southern Confederacy. The ordinance of secession was passed May 6, 1861, affirming not the constitutional right, but the revolutionary right of withdrawal from the Union in the following language: "We, the people of the State of Tennessee, waiving any expression of opinion as to the abstract doctrine of secession, but asserting the right as a free and independent people to alter, reform, or abolish our form of government in such manner as we think proper, do ordain," etc.

On May 7, the state entered into a military league with the Confederacy, and the legislature appropriated $5,000,000 to equip a provisional army of 55,000 men. When the vote was taken, June 8, it stood for secession 104,913, against secession 47,238, for representation in the Confederate Congress 101,701, against representation 47,364. On the 24th of June the governor issued his proclamation formally dissolving the connection of Tennessee with the United States, and on the 2d of July, President Jefferson Davis declared Tennessee a member of the Southern Confederacy. Mr. Bell went with the state.

In the brief political campaign preceding the June election, his influence was actively exerted in favor of the measure which up to that time he had strenuously opposed. He did not advocate nor approve secession as a political doctrine, but in the spirit of the state ordinance, asserted that conditions required the exercise of the right of revolution. Northern writers have condemned him severely for his course at this time. Mr. Blaine says: "If Mr. Bell had taken firm ground for the Union, the secession movement would have been to a very great extent paralyzed in the South." Comparing Bell with Everett he says: "If Mr. Bell had stood beside him with equal courage and equal determination, Tennessee would never have seceded and the Rebellion would have been confined to the seven original states. A large share of the responsibility for the dangerous development of the Rebellion must, therefore, be attributed to John Bell and his half-million Southern supporters of the old Whig party. At the critical moment, they signally failed."

These censures are in a large measure unjust, and they demonstrate the want of an accurate knowledge of Mr. Bell's character and opinions, and of political conditions in the South before the war. Bell was a man of extraordinary purity of character and was sincere in every act and utterance of his public life. He rejected the doctrine that the Constitution authorized secession for any cause. He did not believe that any state could of its own motion lawfully separate from the Union, but upon the other hand he held the Southern rather than the Northern view of the limitations of the Federal government over the states, and was sincere in the belief that the conduct of the government in April, 1861, was so gross a violation of the Constitution, as to justify Tennessee in declaring her independence. It is not intended here to offer any argument in support of these opinions, but only to declare, that whether they were right or wrong, Mr. Bell held them in good faith. Therefore, his conduct at this time was not a "signal failure," but an act of conscience, not a manifestation of weakness of character, but of devotion to conviction and to duty, made fearlessly, but with infinite reluctance and distress.

That anything that he could have done would have prevented the secession of Tennessee is not true. The doctrine of states' rights and state loyalty had pervaded the entire South, and many thousands of genuine patriots and sincere lovers of the Union with aching hearts followed their states out of the Union, under the compulsion of an honest sense of duty. But an overwhelming majority of the people of the slaveholding states demanded secession, and carried their point. The sentiment was irresistible. It has been asserted that Governor Harris forced Tennessee out of the Union, while Bell failed in courage and duty at the critical moment. Against the latter accusation it has already been shown that Bell really displayed courage of the highest order. But it is further true that superficial observers have attributed to Bell and to Harris a degree of influence vastly in excess of what either possessed. The great currents of popular sentiment that were sweeping over the South at that time irresistibly carried all men, great and small, one way or the other. Harris did not cause the secession of Tennessee, and could not have prevented it. If Bell had been a man ten times greater and ten times more influential, he could not have held Tennessee in the Union, after Mr. Lincoln's call for volunteers. That was a task beyond human power. Leaders no longer led. The popular will was supreme. If Bell had not yielded, as he did, to the honest belief that his duty lay with the people of Tennessee, he would have been brushed aside or crushed by this tremendous sentiment. And so if Harris, with all the vigor of his intense and imperious nature, had attempted to stem the tide, he also would have been lost. Both were men of extraordinary force and influence, but the events of the time obscured all persons and all personal influence.

In the war Mr. Bell had no part, and never after 1860 did he attract or seek public attention. He had not been sufficiently in sympathy with secession to win the favor of the South, and at the North much odium was unjustly attached to his name. This country has produced no more sincerely or unselfishly patriotic man, none whose life was more thoroughly squared with conviction. To no American did the war bring deeper grief, and never did opprobrium more unjustly fall upon an honorable and a good man. He died September 18, 1869.

That he was not fitted for times of revolution must be admitted. He was not a man of action, but of thought; a scholar, a philosopher, a scrupulous and cautious, but great statesman. He had almost none of the qualities that made his great antagonist Andrew Jackson a successful popular leader. The scholarly and philosophic cast of his mind, the habit of considering all sides of every question, gave to his conduct sometimes the appearance of indecision. He did not decide quickly, but slowly and carefully, but a conclusion once reached was fearlessly maintained. In later life he perhaps lacked aggressiveness, though this was not true of him in his early days, and especially in his brilliant canvass against Grundy in 1827. He was a leader in the two political struggles which were the most momentous in the history of Tennessee. In the fierce battle against Jackson, he was successful and won the leadership of a great party. In the contest of 1861 he was compelled by a sense of duty to yield, but he retired in honor, and dispassionate history will rank him among the ablest, the purest and the best men our country has produced.

JOSHUA W. CALDWELL.

THE BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG

THE battle of Chancellorsville was fought in the first four days of May, 1863. Hooker, who commanded the Army of the Potomac, met with a terrible defeat at the hands of General Lee, who then gave his army a rest of some weeks. He employed the time in its reorganization, dividing it into three corps, each of three divisions, commanded respectively by Longstreet, Ewell and A. P. Hill. Believing that nothing was to be gained by his army "remaining quietly on the defensive," he decided, with the approval of Davis, on the invasion of Pennsylvania. This movement would at all events, by threatening Washington and drawing Hooker in pursuit of him, relieve Virginia of the presence of a hostile army. But after such victories as Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville he would have been modest past belief had not his expectations gone far beyond so easy an achievement. He hoped to fight the Army of the Potomac on favorable conditions. With his own well-disciplined troops in high spirits and full of confidence in their leader, he could not have entertained an idea that the result would be other than a Confederate victory; perhaps even he might destroy the Union army, when Washington would be at his mercy and he could conquer a peace on Northern soil. Nothing at this time so disturbed the Southern high councils as the operations of Grant against Vicksburg. More than one project was proposed to save it from capture, but no diversion in its favor could be so effectual as the taking of the federal capital. If ever an aggressive movement with so high an object were to be made, now was the time. Not only was it to take advantage of the flush of Confederate success, but the South by delay would lose its efficiency for the offensive. "Our resources in men are constantly diminishing," wrote Lee to Davis, "and the disproportion in this respect between us and our enemies, if they continue united in their efforts to subjugate us, is steadily augmenting." To Lee's ability and decision of character were joined uncommon industry and attention to detail. He was a constant and careful reader of the Northern newspapers, and from the mass of news comment and speculation he drew many correct inferences, and hardly lost sight of any of the conditions which should be taken into account by him who would play well the game of war. He meditated on the weariness of the contest so largely felt at the North and the growing strength of the Democrats, due in the main to Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville. "We should neglect no honorable means of dividing and weakening our enemies," he wrote to Davis. We should "give all the encouragement we can, consistently with the truth, to the rising peace party of the North. Nor do I think we should, in this connection, make nice distinctions between those who declare for peace unconditionally and those who advocate it as a means of restoring the Union, however much we may prefer the former."

June 3 Lee began to move his army from the vicinity of Fredericksburg, and one week later put Ewell's corps in motion for the Shenandoah valley. Ewell drove the Union troops from Winchester and Martinsburg, and on the 15th part of his corps crossed the Potomac, the rest of it soon following. Hill and Longstreet moved forward, and by June 26 their corps had passed over the river and were in Maryland.

Hooker early suspected Lee's project of invasion, and when the movement commenced thought that he ought to attack the rear of the enemy; this operation he suggested to the President. "I have but one idea which I think worth suggesting to you," Lincoln replied, "and that is, in case you find Lee coming to the north of the Rappahannock I would by no means cross to the south of it. If he should leave a rear force at Fredericksburg, tempting you to fall upon it, it would fight in intrenchments and have you at disadvantage, and so, man for man, worst you at that point, while his main force would in some way be getting an advantage of you northward. In one word, I would not take any risk of being entangled upon the river like an ox jumped half over a fence, and liable to be torn by dogs in front and rear, without a fair chance to gore one way or kick the other." When Lee's plan of operations was further disclosed, Hooker proposed to march "to Richmond at once." He felt sure that he could take it, thus "giving the rebellion a mortal blow." Lincoln's reply was prompt. "If left to me," he said, "I would not go south of the Rappahannock upon Lee's moving north of it. If you had Richmond invested to-day, you would not be able to take it in twenty days; meanwhile your communications and with them your army would be ruined. I think Lee's army and not Richmond is your sure objective point. If he comes toward the upper Potomac, follow on his flank and on his inside track, shortening your line while he lengthens his. Fight him, too, when opportunity offers. If he stays where he is, fret him and fret him."

In these despatches Lincoln exhibits common-sense. His diligent reading of military books, the acquirement of knowledge from his generals when occasion offered, the study of the field of war, the close observation of the campaigns and battles of his armies had borne fruit, making him now the best of counsellors in the relation of the civil commander-in-chief to his officers of technical training and experience. Especially at this time was such counsel necessary from a chief who possessed tact and knowledge of men. The relations between Halleck and Hooker were strained. There was a lack of the harmonious co-operation requisite between those holding so responsible positions. "Almost every request I made of General Halleck was refused," testified Hooker, while Halleck complained that Hooker reported directly to the President. The correspondence between the two generals is marked with acerbity. Moreover, some of the corps and division commanders of the Army of the Potomac had lost confidence in their general. This strained situation while the Army of Northern Virginia under its able leader was advancing into the heart of the North might well have dismayed many a stout soul. Lincoln met the crisis without faltering.

When Lee's northward movement seemed certain, Hooker broke up his camps on the Rappahannock. In his march to the Potomac his management and dispositions were excellent. The Confederates kept to the west of the Blue Ridge, he to the east, covering Washington constantly. Ewell waited at Hagerstown, Maryland, until Longstreet and Hill should be within supporting distance. June 22 he received orders allowing him to move forward. "If Harrisburg comes within your means, capture it," was one of the directions which came from Lee. Ewell, advancing into Pennsylvania to Chambersburg, reached Carlisle on the 27th, and sent Early with one division to seize upon York. On the formal surrender of the town by the chief burgess and a deputation of citizens, Early laid it under contribution, receiving 1000 hats, 1200 pairs of shoes, 1000 socks, three days' rations of all kinds, and $28,600 United States money. He destroyed between Hanover Junction and York the Northern Central Railroad, which ran from Baltimore to Harrisburg, and sent an expedition to take possession of the Columbia bridge over the Susquehanna. He intended to march his division across it, cut the line of the Pennsylvania Railroad, take Lancaster, make a requisition upon the town for supplies, and attack Harrisburg in the rear while the rest of Ewell's corps assailed it from the front. But a regiment of Pennsylvania militia in fleeing before the Confederates set fire to the bridge and destroyed it. Meanwhile Ewell sent forward his cavalry with a section of artillery to make a reconnaissance. They approached within three miles of Harrisburg, engaging the pickets of the militia forces assembled there under General Couch for its defence. June 29 Ewell had everything in readiness, and purposed moving on the defences of Harrisburg. Two days previously Longstreet and Hill had reached Chambersburg, and Lee was there in command. His whole army, numbering 75,000 men, was on Pennsylvania soil.

By the middle of June the movements of Lee in Virginia warned the North of the approaching invasion. June 16 the Confederate cavalry were heard of at Chambersburg, and busy preparations were made to defend the threatened points. At one time there was some anxiety for Washington and Baltimore. Stuart in a cavalry raid passed between the Union army and these cities. It was in the Cumberland valley of Pennsylvania, however, that the presence of the enemy was actually and painfully felt. At first the raid of the Confederate horsemen caused excitement. The feeling of relief when they fell back was only temporary, and gave place to alarm and distress as Ewell's corps advanced, and later the rest of Lee's army. The country was wild with rumors. Men, women and children fled before the enemy, and care was taken to run their horses out of the way of the invader. The refugees deemed themselves and their property safe when they had crossed the broad Susquehanna. The bridge over the river, the communication of the Cumberland valley with Harrisburg, was thronged with wagons laden with household goods and furniture. Negroes fled before the advancing host, fearing that they might be dragged back to slavery. June 26 Curtin, the governor of Pennsylvania, issued a proclamation calling for 60,000 men to come forward promptly "to defend their soil, their families, and their firesides." Harrisburg, the capital of the state, was indeed in danger, as was realized by the authorities and the citizens. Thirty regiments of Pennsylvania militia, besides artillery and cavalry, and nineteen regiments from New York assembled under the command of General Couch, who disposed his forces to the best advantage, stationing a large portion of them for the defence of Harrisburg. In the city all places of business were closed, and citizens labored on the fortifications with the pick and the spade. Men were enrolled by wards and drilled in the park and on the streets. The railroad depot was a scene of excitement, caused by the arrival of volunteers in large numbers, and the departure of women and frightened men. The progress of the enemy was pretty accurately known. Reports ran that he was twenty-three miles from the city, then eighteen. June 28 cannonading was heard for two hours, and everyone knew that the Confederates were within four miles of the Capitol. Harrisburg would probably have been taken had not Ewell's corps been called back by Lee.

If Harrisburg were captured it was thought that the Confederates would march on Philadelphia. Men well informed believed that Lee had nearly 100,000 men and 250 pieces of artillery. On the evening of June 28 the rumor circulated in Philadelphia that the Confederates were shelling Harrisburg. Chestnut and Market streets were thronged with thousands of men eager for the news. The next day two prominent citizens telegraphed the President that they had reliable information that the enemy in large force was marching upon Philadelphia. Other men of influence desired him to give the general in command authority to declare martial law. Business stopped. The merchants, the manufacturers of iron, the proprietors of machine-shops, the coal operators held meetings and offered inducements to their workmen to enlist for the defence of the state. The members of the Corn Exchange furnished five companies. A meeting of the soldiers of the War of 1812 and another of clergymen were held to offer their services for home defence. It was said that bankers and merchants were making preparations to remove specie and other valuables from the city. Receipts and shipments on the Pennsylvania Railroad were suspended. With all the disturbance and alarm there was no panic. The excitement was at its height from June 27 to July 1. July 1 the sale of government five-twenties for the day amounted to $1,700,000. Few trains were running on the eastern division of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and it was expected that the track would in many places be destroyed, yet the shares of this company sold in Philadelphia at 61¾ June 27, and at 60 July 1, on a par basis of 50—a fact as worthy of report as the story of Livy that the ground on which Hannibal encamped his army three miles from Rome, happening at that very time to be sold, brought a price none the lower on account of its possession by the invaders. While gold advanced in New York, there was no panic in the stock market.

When the alarm at the invasion of Pennsylvania was at its height, when every man in the North tremblingly took up his morning newspaper and with a sinking heart watched the daily bulletins, the intelligence came that there had been a change in commanders of the Army of the Potomac. Those in authority depended for the salvation of Harrisburg, Baltimore, and Washington on this army, which the public with its half-knowledge of the situation also felt to be their mainstay.

Hooker, following upon Lee's right flank and covering Washington, crossed the Potomac, and June 27 made his headquarters at Frederick, Maryland. He proposed to strike Lee's line of communications with Richmond, and desired the garrison of 10,000, holding Maryland Heights, which commanded Harper's Ferry, as a reinforcement to the corps which he had ordered to march west for that purpose. "Is there any reason why Maryland Heights should not be abandoned?" he asked Halleck. "I cannot approve their abandonment," was the answer, "except in case of absolute necessity." Hooker wrote a reply proving that the troops in question were "of no earthly account at Harper's Ferry," while, if placed at his disposition, they might be used with advantage. He ended his despatch with begging that it be presented to the President and the Secretary of War. Immediately after he had sent it, his growing anger at what he considered the unwise and shackling instructions of the general-in-chief prompted him to write, apparently in a fit of petulance, a second despatch asking to be relieved of his position. Halleck received the second telegram five minutes after the first, and referred it to the President. Lincoln made up his mind quickly, and sent an officer to the Army of the Potomac with an order relieving Hooker and appointing in his place George G. Meade. It was an excellent choice. Meade looked like a student, had scholarly habits, was an officer of courage and ability, and commanded now the Fifth Corps, having served in the Potomac army with credit, even distinction. Receiving the communication from the President late on the night of June 27 or early the next morning, he answered it at 7 A. M. in a tone of genuineness which betokened confidence. "As a soldier," he said, "I obey the order placing me in command of this army, and to the utmost of my ability will execute it." The appointment was satisfactory to the officers of the army. Although the risk was great in making a change of generals at so critical a moment, Fortune attended the step and smiled on the new commander during the next five days which gave him fame.

"You are intrusted," wrote Halleck to Meade, "with all the power which the President, the Secretary of War, or the General-in-Chief can confer upon you, and you may rely upon our full support." In answer to a specific inquiry, Meade received for a second time the permission to do as he pleased with the garrison on Maryland Heights. He withdrew it, and posted the larger part of the troops at Frederick as a reserve.

He estimated Lee's force at 80,000 to 100,000; his own he placed at the larger number. His resolution was prompt. June 29 and 30 he advanced northward, and by the evening of the

30th the First Corps had crossed the Pennsylvania line, while the Third and the Eleventh were in the northern part of Maryland; these three constituting the left wing of the army under the command of General Reynolds. The Twelfth Corps lay in Pennsylvania, but at some distance east of the First. Meade established his headquarters at Taneytown, Maryland, thirteen miles south of Gettysburg, retaining the Second and Fifth Corps within easy reach. The Sixth Corps was likewise in Maryland, but lay farther to the eastward, thirty-four miles from Gettysburg. Meade had been prompt to command, his subordinates zealous to obey. The officers, sinking for the moment all their rivalries and jealousies, were careful and untiring in their efforts, while the soldiers did wonders in making long and rapid marches in the hot sun and sultry air of the last days of June. The main idea of Meade had been "to find and fight the enemy," at the same time covering Baltimore and Washington. Hearing now that Lee was falling back and concentrating his army, he announced his present design in a despatch to Halleck: "The news proves that my advance has answered its purpose," he said. "I shall not advance any, but prepare to receive an attack in case Lee makes one. A battle-field is being selected to the rear on which the army can be rapidly concentrated."

The first mistake in Lee's campaign arose from the absence of Stuart's cavalry. He had no accurate and speedy knowledge of the movements of the Federals. His own and Longstreet's instructions to Stuart lacked precision, and Stuart made an unwise use of his discretion. Forgetting perhaps that the main use of horsemen in an enemy's country is to serve as the eyes of the army, the spirit of adventure led him into a raid about the Union troops which lost him all communication with the Confederate army, so that Lee was in the dark as to the progress of his adversary. On the night of June 28 a scout brought word to him that the Union army had crossed the Potomac and was advancing northward. His communications with Virginia were menaced, and he did not dare to let them be intercepted. He might indeed for a while live upon the country, but he could not in his position suffer the interruption of his supplies of ammunition. He called Ewell back from his projected attack upon Harrisburg, and ordered him as well as Longstreet and Hill to march to Gettysburg, on the east side of the South Mountain range.

July 1 Reynolds came in contact with the Confederates. Buford with his cavalry having the day before taken possession of Gettysburg and occupied Seminary Ridge west of the town was resisting their advance when Reynolds with the First Corps came to his assistance. Sending orders to Howard to advance promptly with the Eleventh, Reynolds selected the battle-field and opened the battle of Gettysburg, but he did not live to see the result of his heroic stand. Before noon he received a bullet in his brain and died instantly. "The death of this splendid officer," writes Fitzhugh Lee with grace, "was regretted by friend and foe," and borrowing the words of another, he adds, "No man died on that field with more glory than he; yet many died, and there was much glory!"

After Reynold's death matters went badly for the First and Eleventh Corps. They were "overborne by superior numbers and forced back through Gettysburg with great slaughter." Buford's despatch of 3:20 P. M. points out an important reason for the defeat. "In my opinion," he said, "there seems to be no directing person." All was confusion and looked like disaster when Hancock arrived on the field. On hearing that Reynolds was killed, Meade, with his excellent judgment of the right man for the place, sent Hancock forward to take the command. He restored order and inspired confidence while the Union troops were placed in a strong position on Cemetery Hill, east of the town. It is thought that if the Confederates had been prompt they might have carried the height, but the order to do so from Lee to Ewell was conditional, and with his force then present he did not deem the attempt practicable. Nevertheless, the first day of the battle of Gettysburg was a Confederate success.

Late in the afternoon of July 1 Slocum with the Twelfth Corps had arrived at Gettysburg. Sickles with the Third Corps marched thither with celerity and zeal. The reports of Hancock, Howard, and others decided Meade that Gettysburg was a good place to fight his battle, and he issued orders to all of his corps to concentrate at that point. He himself arrived upon the battle-field at one in the morning, pale, tired-looking, hollow-eyed, and worn out from want of sleep, anxiety, and the weight of responsibility.

By the afternoon of July 2, Lee and Meade had their whole forces on the field, the armies being about a mile apart. Lee had 70,000, Meade 93,500, less the losses of the first day, which had been much greater on the Union than on the Confederate side. The Confederates occupied Seminary Ridge in a line concave in form, the Federals Cemetery Ridge in a convex line, a position admirably adapted for defence. Meade decided to await attack, and if he had studied closely the character and history of his energetic adversary, he might have been almost certain that it would come. Longstreet, however, differed with his commander. In a conversation at the close of the first day's fight, he expressed a desire that their troops be thrown around the left of the Union army, interposing themselves between it and Washington and forcing Meade to take the offensive. The anxiety of Lee at not receiving any information from his cavalry had become excitement, and, somewhat irritated at a suggestion contrary to what he had determined upon, he said, "No, the enemy is there and I am going to attack him." From the commencement of his invasion, he had shown contempt of his foe. The stretching of his line from Fredericksburg to Winchester in the face of an opponent who had greater numbers can bear no other construction. While he deemed Meade a better general than Hooker, he thought that the change of commanders at this critical moment counterbalanced the advantage in generalship; and while he was astonished at the rapid and efficient movements of the Army of the Potomac after Meade took command, he had undoubtedly become convinced from his almost unvarying success that he and his army were invincible—a confidence shared by nearly all of his officers and men. His victories on his own soil were extraordinary, but if we compare his campaigns of invasion with those of Napoleon we shall see how far he fell short when he undertook operations in an unfriendly country, although the troops that followed him were in fighting qualities unsurpassed. "Except in equipment," writes General Alexander, "I think a better army, better nerved up to its work, never marched upon a battle-field." With such soldiers, if Lee had been as great a general as Napoleon, Gettysburg had been an Austerlitz, Washington and the Union had fallen.

Lee was up betimes on the morning of July 2, but the movements of his soldiers were slow, and he lost much of the advantage of his more speedy concentration than Meade's. The afternoon was well advanced when he began his attack, and by that time the last of the Union army, the Sixth Corps, which had marched thirty-four miles in eighteen hours, was arriving. There was tremendous fighting and heavy loss that afternoon on both wings of each army. On the Union side Warren and Humphreys distinguished themselves. Sickles was struck by a cannon-ball that caused the loss of a leg, and was borne from the field. The result of the day is accurately told by Lee: "We attempted to dislodge the enemy, and, though we gained some ground, we were unable to get possession of his position." The Confederate assaults had been disjointed: to that mistake is ascribed their small success.

The feeling among the officers in Meade's camp that night was one of gloom. On the first day of the battle the First and Eleventh corps had been almost annihilated. On the second day the Fifth and part of the Second had been shattered; the Third, in the words of its commander who succeeded Sickles, was "used up and not in good condition to fight." The loss of the army had been 20,000 men. Only the Sixth and Twelfth corps were fresh. But the generals had not lost spirit, and in the council of war called by Meade all voted to "stay and fight it out." The rank and file had fought as Anglo-Saxons nearly always fight on their own soil. We may guess that on this gloomy night the men went over again in their minds the fate of their army when under Pope, Burnside and Hooker it had encountered the veterans of Lee, but in spite of this doleful retrospect they must have felt in some measure "the spirit that animated general headquarters," the energy of Meade and the faithful co-operation of his generals.

Meade had no thought of taking the offensive, and was busy in improving the natural defences of his position with earthworks. The partial successes of the Confederates determined Lee to continue the attack on the 3d of July. In the early morning there was fighting on the right of the Union line. Then followed an unnatural stillness. "The whole field became as silent as a churchyard until one o'clock." Suddenly came from the Confederate side the reports of two signal guns in quick succession. A bombardment from one hundred and fifteen cannon commenced, and was replied to by eighty guns of the Union army, whose convex line, advantageous in other respects, did not admit of their bringing into action a large part of their artillery. "It was a most terrific and appalling cannonade," said Hancock. But it did little damage. The Union soldiers lay under the protection of stone walls, swells of the ground, and earthworks, and the projectiles of the enemy passed over their heads, sweeping the open ground in their rear. Everybody from the commanding general to the privates felt that this was only preliminary to an infantry charge, and all braced themselves for the tug of war. Hancock with his staff, his corps flag flying, rode deliberately along the front of his line, and by his coolness and his magnificent presence inspired his men with courage and determination. For an hour and a half this raging cannonade was kept up, when Hunt, the chief of the Union artillery, finding his ammunition running low, gave the order to cease firing. The Confederates thought that they had silenced the Federal batteries, and made preparation for their next move.

Longstreet had no sympathy with the vigorously offensive tactics of his chief; and when Lee on the morning of this July 3 directed him to be ready after the bombardment had done its work to make an attack with Pickett's fresh division reinforced from

Hill's corps up to 15,000 men, he demurred, arguing that the assault could not succeed. Lee showed a little impatience, apparently made no reply, and by silence insisted on the execution of his order. Longstreet took Pickett to the crest of Seminary Ridge, pointed out to him what was to be done, and left him with a heavy heart. Alexander of the artillery was directed to note carefully the effect of his fire, and when the favorable moment came to give Pickett the order to charge. He did not like this responsibility, and asked Longstreet for specific instructions, but the reply which came lacked precision. Still the artillery must open, and when the fire of the Federal guns had ceased, as has been related, Alexander, looking anxiously through his glass at the points whence it had proceeded, and observing no sign of life in the five minutes that followed, sent word to Pickett: "For God's sake, come quick . . . Come quick, or my ammunition won't let me support you properly." Pickett went to Longstreet. "General, shall I advance?" he asked. Longstreet could not speak, but bowed in answer. "Sir," said Pickett, with a determined voice, "I shall lead my division forward." Alexander had ceased firing. Longstreet rode to where he stood, and exclaimed: "I don't want to make this attack. I would stop it now but that General Lee ordered it and expects it to go on. I don't see how it can succeed." But as he spoke Pickett at the head of his troops rode over the crest of Seminary Ridge and began his descent down the slope. "As he passed me," writes Longstreet, "he rode gracefully, with his jaunty cap raked well over on his right ear, and his long auburn locks, nicely dressed, hanging almost to his shoulders. He seemed a holiday soldier." From the other side the Union soldiers watched the advance of Pickett and his fifteen thousand with suspense, with admiration. As they came forward steadily and in perfect order with banners flying, those who looked on might for the moment have thought it a Fourth of July parade.

The Confederates had nearly a mile to go across the valley. As they descended the slope on that clear afternoon under the July sun in full view of their foe, they received a dreadful fire from the Union batteries, which had been put in entire readiness to check such an onset. Steadily and coolly they advanced. After they had got away the Confederate artillery reopened over their heads, in the effort to draw the deadly fire directed at them from Cemetery Ridge; but the Union guns made no change in aim, and went on mowing down Pickett's men. Half-way across there was the shelter of a ravine. They stopped for a moment to breathe, then advanced again, still in good order. A storm of canister came. The slaughter was terrible. The left staggered; but, nothing daunted, Pickett and what was left of his own division of forty-nine hundred pressed on in the lead. The other divisions followed. Now the Union infantry opened fire. Pickett halted at musket range and discharged a volley, then rushed on up the slope. Near the Federal lines he made a pause "to close ranks and mass for a final plunge." In the last assault Armistead, a brigade commander, pressed forward, leaped the stone wall, waved his sword with his hat on it, shouted, "Give them the cold steel, boys!" and laid his hands upon a gun. A hundred of his men had followed. They planted the Confederate battle-flags on Cemetery Ridge among the cannon they had captured and for the moment held. Armistead was shot down; Garnett and Kemper, Pickett's other brigadiers, fell. The wavering divisions of Hill's corps "seemed appalled, broke their ranks," and fell back. "The Federals swarmed around Pickett," writes Longstreet, "attacking on all sides, enveloped and broke up his command. They drove the fragments back upon our lines." Pickett gave the word to retreat.

The Confederates in their charge struck the front of the Second Corps. Hancock, its commander, "the best tactician of the Potomac army," showed the same reckless courage as Pickett, and seemed to be everywhere directing and encouraging his troops. Struck by a ball, he fell from his horse; and lying on the ground, "his wound spouting blood," he raised himself on his elbow and gave the order, "Go in, Colonel, and give it to them on the flank." Not until the battle of Gettysburg was over did he resign himself to his surgeon, and shortly afterwards he dictated this despatch to Meade: "I have never seen a more formidable attack, and if the Sixth and Fifth corps have pressed up the enemy will be destroyed. . . . I did not leave the field until the victory was entirely secured and the enemy no longer in sight. I am badly wounded, though I trust not seriously. I had to break the line to attack the enemy in flank on my right, where the enemy was most persistent after the front attack was repelled. Not a rebel was in sight upright when I left."

Decry war as we may and ought, "breathes there the man with soul so dead" who would not thrill with emotion to claim for his countrymen the men who made that charge and the men who met it?

Longstreet, calm and self-possessed, meriting the name "bulldog" applied to him by his soldiers, expected a counter attack and made ready for it. Lee, entirely alone, rode up to encourage and rally his broken troops. "His face did not show signs of the slightest disappointment, care, or annoyance," recorded Lieut.-Col. Fremantle, an English officer, in his diary on the day of the battle, "and he was addressing to every soldier he met a few words of encouragement, such as, 'All this will come right in the end; we'll talk it over afterwards, but in the mean time all good men must rally. We want all good and true men just now.' He spoke to all the wounded men that passed him, and the slightly wounded he exhorted 'to bind up their hurts and take up a musket' in this emergency. Very few failed to answer his appeal, and I saw many badly wounded men take off their hats and cheer him. He said to me, 'This has been a sad day for us, Colonel—a sad day; but we can't expect always to gain victories.' . . .

"Notwithstanding the misfortune which had so suddenly befallen him, General Lee seemed to observe everything, however trivial. When a mounted officer began licking his horse for shying at the bursting of a shell, he called out, 'Don't whip him, Captain; don't whip him. I've got just such another foolish horse myself, and whipping does no good.'"

An officer almost angry came up to report the state of his brigade. "General Lee immediately shook hands with him and said cheerfully, 'Never mind, General, *all this has been* MY *fault*—it is *I* that have lost this fight, and you must help me out of it in the best way you can.'"

On the morning of the Fourth of July the people of the North received this word: "The President announces to the country that news from the Army of the Potomac, up to 10 P. M. of the 3d, is such as to cover that army with the highest honor, to promise a great success to the cause of the Union, and to claim the condolence of all for the many gallant fallen, and that for this he especially desires that on this day He whose will, not ours, should ever be done be everywhere remembered and reverenced with profoundest gratitude." The rejoicing of the people was not boisterous; it took the character of supreme thankfulness for a great deliverance. The victory of Gettysburg demonstrated that Lee and his army were not invincible, and that the Confederates had lost in playing the card of an invasion of the North. Nothing now remained to them but a policy of stubborn defence. That this would likewise end in ruin was foreshadowed by the fateful event of the Fourth of July. Vicksburg surrendered to General Grant. Meade's sturdy and victorious resistance to attack was followed by the glorious end of the most brilliant offensive campaign of the war. Had the war been one between two nations, it would now have undoubtedly terminated in a treaty of peace, with conditions imposed largely by the more successful contestant.

JAMES FORD RHODES.

DOCUMENTS

Attempts toward Colonization: the Council for New England and the Merchant Venturers of Bristol, 1621–1623.

[Communicated by Miller Christy, Esq., of Pryors, Broomfield, Chelmsford, England.]

SEVERAL years since, through the kindness of Mr. G. H. Pope, Treasurer of the Society of Merchant Venturers of Bristol, I was permitted to examine the early records of that body and to extract therefrom information necessary for a work on certain early Arctic voyages upon which I was then engaged.[1] On that occasion, I observed, and partly extracted, some documents in which were recorded the various steps taken between the years 1621 and 1623, by the New England Company or Council for New England (of which Sir Ferdinando Gorges was the founder and leading spirit) to induce the Bristol Society of Merchant Venturers and others to join in its attempts to forward the settlement of New England. Recently, through Mr. Pope's continued kindness, I have been able to examine these documents with greater care and to extract them fully. They are of no little interest in connection with the history of the early attempts to colonize New England; and, as they have remained until now quite unknown, I propose in what follows to print them in full, together with such explanatory matter as may seem desirable.

Before considering the documents themselves, it will be well to introduce briefly—(1) The ancient Bristol merchants' guild among whose archives they have lain hidden for nearly three hundred years; (2) Sir Ferdinando Gorges, the man to whose efforts the first attempts to colonize New England were mainly due; and (3) the chartered company, commonly known as the "New England Company," which he formed to carry out his schemes.

(1) The Fellowship, Society, or Company (as it is variously called) of Merchant Venturers of Bristol is a very interesting and almost unique survival from early times. In medieval days, Bristol (like most other of the larger English cities and towns) possessed many more or less similar organizations; but, of all these, the one

---

[1] *The Voyages of Captain Luke Foxe, of Hull, and Captain Thomas James, of Bristol, in Search of a North-west Passage, in 1631–32* (London, Hakluyt Society, two vols., 1894.)

in question alone now exists. Of its foundation there is no record ;[1] but traces of such a guild are discoverable as early as 1314, and it probably existed in some form much earlier. By the year 1467 the Society was fully organized, and in 1500 an elaborate code of "Actes and Ordenaunces" (which still exists) was framed for its regulation.

In these early days, the Society appears to have been little more than a sort of trade-committee of the Bristol town council; but, in 1552, King Edward VI. granted to it a charter, under which its independence was secured and it was incorporated as "The Master, Wardens, and Commonalty of Merchant Venturers of the City of Bristol." One Edward Pryn was named as the first master, and the first wardens were Thomas Hickes and Robert Butler. Fresh charters, under which its rights and privileges were confirmed or extended, were granted to it by Queen Elizabeth, by Charles I., and by Charles II. The most important of these charters was that of Charles I., under which its constitution was finally settled, much on the lines at present existing. It gave to the master and wardens ten of "the gravest and discreetest" members as assistants. The "Court" of thirteen members thus constituted still forms the executive body, and is elected annually on "Charter Day" (the 10th of November), as the master and wardens had been long before King Charles I. granted his charter. Under all these charters, the privilege of membership was confined to freemen of Bristol; and, although these freemen have long been decreasing in number and now form a very small portion of the whole body of citizens, what follows will show that the affairs of the Society have been well and wisely administered.

An ancient record states that, in the reign of Edward IV., the Society occupied, for business purposes, "the Chappell and Draughte Chameber apperteyninge thereto in the hows callyd Spyceris Halle, uppon the Back of Bristowe." In 1561, nine years after the Society was first incorporated, it acquired, and thenceforth used as its common hall, the desecrated chapel of St. Clement, in Avon Marsh. The site of this building is still the property of the Company. Upon it, in 1701, they erected the present "Merchants' Hall"—an unpretentious but commodious building, in the classic style, to which a handsome council chamber was added at the back in the early years of the present century.

From the time of Queen Elizabeth (and probably from a much earlier time, of which there are no records), right down to the present day, the history of the Bristol Society of Merchant Venturers has been the history of commercial enterprise and civic progress in the city of Bristol. The roll of its members' names has been a list of the leading burgesses; and its master, during his year of office, holds a position in the city scarcely inferior to those of the mayor and sheriff. It may be doubted whether, during the last three centuries, Bristol has not received as great benefits from its Society of Merchant Venturers as from its town council. The Society's records show that, for a long period, it watched with a jealous eye over the trade of the port of Bristol, and left undone nothing which might tend to increase its prosperity. Although the Society has ceased, for a long time past, to exercise its original functions, the benefits it has bestowed upon the city have become increasingly apparent.

---

[1] No history of the Society has ever been written, and I am indebted to Mr. Pope for the following information concerning it.

It was the Society of Merchant Venturers which built Bristol's wharves and quays, largely with borrowed money and at an outlay which long remained unremunerative. It was the Society which presented Clifton Downs to the citizens. The latest of the Society's munificent gifts to Bristol is, perhaps, not the least. In 1696 and 1708, Edward Colston, a prominent citizen of Bristol and a leading member of the Merchant Venturers' Guild, founded an almshouse and a free boarding school, which he endowed with certain lands, of which he constituted the Society trustee. The almshouse still remains under the Society's control; but, in 1875, the Charity Commissioners framed a new scheme for the management of the school. Ten years later, the new scheme was proved unworkable, and then the Society came to the rescue. In 1885, it erected, on the site of the old grammar school and in the centre of the town, the splendid block of buildings now known as the Merchant Venturers Technical College. The Society met the entire cost of building the college which amounted to about £50,000, and now continues to maintain it solely out of its own funds. Nearly 2000 students—men, women and boys—now pass annually through the college, which is perfectly equipped, and the scheme has proved in the highest degree successful.

The ancient records belonging to the Society are not numerous, considering its antiquity and importance. They consist of the charters and the code of rules[1] already mentioned, the minutes of proceedings,[2] and various other miscellaneous documents. Among the latter is a large, thick, leather-bound, folio volume, labelled on the back *Book of*

---

[1] The code of rules is the earliest *original* document now existing, earlier documents being copies merely

[2] The minutes of proceedings previous to 1639 contain little more than the names of the masters, wardens and treasurers annually appointed; but after that date the minutes are fairly full.

Trade, 1598–1693; in it are copied a large number of letters, petitions, statistical returns, and other documents relating to the rights and privileges of the Society and the trade of the port of Bristol, all carefully indexed. These, it must be understood, are *not originals, but office copies,* entered in the book for safe keeping and future reference. They are nearly all written with extreme neatness; and it appears probable, judging from the hand-writing, that all the earlier documents were entered by the same hand and all at one time—not as received or dispatched by the Company. In addition to the documents (ten in number) with which I am specially concerned and shall describe hereafter, there are lists of Bristol ships lost or sold to foreigners; particulars of wharfage and other duties payable on goods entering the port; statistics of the produce imported into Bristol during the seventeenth century; correspondence with the Lords of the Admiralty and Admiral Sir Thomas Button[1] in reference to the guarding of the Severn estuary against the ravages of pirates; letters and other documents relating to the expedition which the Society, or a number of its leading members, sent out, in 1631, under Captain Thomas James, to search for a Northwest Passage to Cathay through Hudson's Bay;[2] petitions to the Crown in favor of rights and privileges which had been infringed by the merchants of London and elsewhere; correspondence as to the contributions in money, ships, and men to be given by the Bristol merchants towards the suppression of pirates (whether the Spaniards and Dunkirkers in 1597 or the "Turkes of Algier" nearly a hundred years later) and the redeeming of English captives known to be in their hands; and many other documents of similar nature. It is true that most of them are mainly of local importance; but all are worthy of the notice of some competent historian.

The foregoing constitute (as has been said) a meagre collection of records compared with that which such a society might have been expected to possess. Undoubtedly many earlier records have been lost. A number are known to have been taken away in the seventeenth century, and the Society has recently made a praiseworthy, but unsuccessful, attempt to recover these by the offer, through the public press, of a substantial reward. Were they in existence they would probably prove of the utmost interest in throwing light upon the early trade in fish between Bristol and Iceland; upon the expeditions carried out by Thlyde and others, between 1480 and 1497, in search of the fabulous Atlantean Island of Brazil, of which William Worcester (or Botoner[1]), Don Pedro de Ayala,[2] and other writers have made mention; upon the important voyages of John Cabot in 1497 and 1498, as to which we have extremely little direct information; upon the voyage of Captain Martin Pring to the coast of "Virginia" in 1603, dispatched (as Purchas says) by "sundry of the chiefest merchants of Bristol"; and upon many other similar ventures undertaken by the enterprising inhabitants of that ancient sea-port.

---

[1] Thomas Button, fourth son of Miles Button, of Worlton, Glamorganshire, was born about 1570 and entered the navy in 1589. In 1612, he was chosen to command an expedition sent out to search for a North-west Passage by way of Hudson's Bay. Soon after his return in the following year he was appointed for life Admiral of the Narrow Seas (the Irish Channel), and he saw much active service while serving in this capacity. He died in 1634.

[2] These letters and documents are printed in full in my work (already alluded to) on the voyages of Captains Luke Foxe and Thomas James to Hudson's Bay in 1631 (pp cv.–cvii. and cxxxix.–clxviii.).

It has already been remarked that the Bristol society is an almost unique survival. The only other similar society which now exists outside of London, and is at all comparable with it in respect of age, nature, and importance, is the Society of Merchant Adventurers of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. This body claims to have existed since the reign of King John and possesses a large and most interesting collection of records, ranging in almost unbroken series from the year 1480 to the present time.[3] Another similar society of lesser importance, though equally ancient, is the Society of Merchant Adventurers of York, which claims to date from the year 1200 and still exists. It has a limited number of ancient records.[4] Yet another somewhat similar body, though apparently of much more recent origin than any of the foregoing, was that which bore the cumbrous title of "The Governor, Consults, and Societie of Merchant Adventurers of the City of Exon traffiquinge to the Realme of ffraunce and the Dominions of the ffrench Kings." It was incorporated by a charter granted by Queen Elizabeth on June 17, 1560, but probably existed in some form at an earlier date.

[1] In his *Itinerarium sive Liber Rerum Memorabilium* preserved in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge

[2] In his well-known letter dated July 25, 1498 (see *Calendar of State Papers, Spanish Series*, I. 176–177.

[3] Extensive extracts from these records are in course of being printed in a work edited by Mr. F. W. Dendy and printed by the Surtees Society. The first volume was published in 1895 and a second is in preparation.

[4] See the *First Report of the Royal Historical Manuscripts Commission* (1870), p. 110. The Society's ancient hall—one of the most interesting secular buildings in York—still stands in Fossgate. Over the entrance, facing the street, is the coat of arms of the Society, sculptured large and blazoned in colors, with its quaint motto, *Dieu nous donne bonne aventure.* Within is a court-yard, beyond which is the Merchant's Hall. On the ground floor is a small chapel, apparently of the early part of the fifteenth century. Above it, on the first floor, is the large timber-built common hall, of somewhat later date, its walls hung with portraits of leading members, extending back for three centuries. The place is freely shown to all and is well worth a visit.

Though it has long ceased to exist, some of its old records, extending in date to the end of the reign of Elizabeth, have been preserved.[1] Leaving out of account the great London companies, there also still remain, in some other of the more ancient English cities and towns, a few smaller companies, relics of the many medieval guilds, which concern themselves with special trades. The Trinity Houses of Kingston-upon-Hull and Newcastle-upon-Tyne are also worth noticing in this connection, as having had their origin in similar early guilds.

Such, then, has been the history of the ancient medieval guild, still existing in an altered and modernized form, which has preserved among its archives the documents hereafter to be noticed. It will next be necessary to speak of the man whose efforts towards the colonization of New England those documents record.

(2) Sir Ferdinando Gorges—the "Father of English Colonization in North America," as he has been aptly termed—came of a family of good position, long seated at Wraxall, in Somersetshire. He was probably born in or about 1566, but the exact date is uncertain. Early in life, he adopted the profession of arms. In 1591, during the siege of Rouen, at which he was wounded, he received from his commander, Robert Earl of Essex, the honor of knighthood in recognition of his services.[2] Before this, he had had charge of the defences of Plymouth, where he seems to have acted as a sort of military governor, though often absent on active service abroad. In 1605, he took a leading part in promoting the voyage made by Captain George Weymouth to the coast of what is now the state of Maine; and, when Weymouth returned to Plymouth in the fall of the same year, bringing with him five North American Indians, natives of the country he had visited, Gorges received three of them into his own house. From his intercourse with them after they had begun to learn English, he became deeply interested in what they told him of their country. Out of this interest, there grew up in his mind a project for the colonization of the land of which the Indians had told him; and to his efforts was due, in a large measure, the establishment of the Virginia Company in the year 1606. It will be remembered that King James, by the charter of April 10, 1606, authorized the establishment of two separate colonies, a southern and a northern; that the second (or northern) colony, controlled

---

[1] These were discovered some years since, among the papers of the still-existing Society of Weavers, Fullers, and Shearmen of Exeter, and extensive extracts from them were printed by Mr. William Cotton in *An Elizabethan Guild of the City of Exeter* (Exeter, 1873).

[2] See Metcalfe's *Book of Knights* (London, 1885), p. 137. Twenty-two other knights were made on the same occasion.

from Plymouth, was a failure from the beginning; and that in 1620, on petition of Gorges, a patent was issued incorporating a new Plymouth Company, commonly called the Council for New England. This patent (now often spoken of as "The Great Patent of New England") finally passed the seals on November 3, 1620, and must next be noticed.

(3) By this patent the King incorporated "a body politicque and corporate," to be called "The Council established at Plymouth, in the County of Devon, for the planting, ruling, ordering, and governing of New England in America." It was to consist, in perpetual succession, of not more than forty members. The King granted to it for ever (subject only to his own supreme sovereignty) the whole of that portion of North America extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific and lying between the fortieth and the forty-eighth degrees of north latitude, which region was henceforth to be known as New England. The rest of the charter is occupied by provisions as to the election of a governor and other officers, the admission of new members, the administration of justice within the company's territories, the punishment of offenders, the settlement and government of the territory, and such like matters. It is provided that, for seven years, all goods imported into the colony from England shall be free from duty; also that, for twenty-one years, all goods imported into England from the colony shall be admitted free from all duty, except an impost of five per cent. The rights of fishing along the coast were specifically granted to the company, which was empowered to seize and confiscate the ships and goods of any person who might, without the company's consent, resort to the colony or the adjacent seas for the purpose of trading or fishing.

The violent opposition which the company experienced at the outset of its career[1] naturally hindered it from commencing the work of colonization for which it had been formed. Nevertheless, there is evidence that meetings of the Council were held during the year 1621, and a certain amount of business was transacted—chiefly the consideration of measures for "freeing" the company's patent or procuring a new one, for commencing the actual settlement of the company's territories, and for preventing the infringement of the company's rights by unauthorized persons who were seeking to trade within its territories or fish along its coasts. This brings us to the consideration of the ten documents preserved at Bristol, of which five relate to the steps taken by the company at this period, and are, it is believed, the earliest records of the company's proceedings now in existence.

---

[1] The controversy which took place over the patent has been admirably summarized by Dr. Charles Deane in Winsor's *Narrative and Critical History of America*, III. 295-310.

The first of these (I.) is a copy of a letter, bearing the date September 18, 1621, from the Privy Council of England to the mayors of Bristol, Exeter, Plymouth, and other west-country towns. It has been printed by Brodhead[1] from the copy in the Register of the Acts of the Privy Council, and therefore is not printed here. The letter (which is signed by nine privy councillors and by the clerk of the Privy Council) recites that, although the New England Company had offered every facility to merchants and others to become partakers in its rights and privileges, by consenting to admit them as members, nevertheless unauthorized persons, not members, had infringed or sought to infringe its exclusive rights by resorting to New England in order to trade or fish there; for which reason the Council wrote desiring the mayors of the cities and towns most concerned to warn their respective townsmen that, in future, all such infringements of the company's rights would be strictly dealt with and severely punished. Without doubt, this letter was written at the request of the New England Company, which sought to strengthen its position and to better establish its rights by obtaining such a warning letter. It appears probable, from what follows, that the particular copy of the letter which was intended for the mayor of Bristol was entrusted to Sir Ferdinando Gorges, who delivered it in person to the mayor, together with a certain other document to be noticed hereafter. The mayor, Robert Rogers by name, doubtless thought that he could not better carry out the wishes of the Privy Council than by communicating a copy of the letter to the Society of Merchant Venturers of Bristol, and this accounts for its appearance among the records of that body.[2]

The second of the Bristol documents is that, already mentioned, which Sir Ferdinando Gorges delivered to the mayor with the letter above alluded to. It is undated, but passages in the two succeeding documents leave no doubt that it is of about the same date as the letter (namely September, 1621). It sets out, in thirty clauses or "articles," a formal scheme, which the company had drawn up, for the regulation of the trade with, and for promoting the settlement of, New England. The company, it appears, did not intend to undertake trading or colonizing on its own account, but wished to farm out its rights by means of a license to be granted to a subsidiary joint-stock company, which was itself to consist of several smaller affiliated companies, one in each of the five chief west-country ports. There were to be committees, each consisting of eighteen members or "commissioners," in the cities of Bristol and Exeter, and similar committees, but each consisting of twelve members only, in the towns of Plymouth, Dartmouth and Barnstaple. Each committee was to be more or less independent and self-controlled, with its own treasurer, clerk, registrar, and other officers; but it was desired that all should co-operate in working; and, to facilitate this, it was provided that a general meeting should be held half-yearly at the more-or-less-centrally-situated town of Tiverton. The "Articles and Orders" intended to control the working of these local committees under the general supervision of the Council for New England are very quaint and curious; but it must be admitted that they do not strike one as very workable or practical, and this was the view taken of them (as will be seen hereafter) by the shrewd Bristol merchants of the time. The "Articles and Orders" in question run as follows:[1]

---

[1] *N. Y. Col. Docs*, III. 5.

[2] *Book of Trade, 1598–1693*, fo. 104.

[II.] *Articles and Orders Concluded on by the* PRESIDENT *and* COUNSELL *for the Affaires of* NEW ENGLAND *for the better Government of the Trade and* [*for the*] *Advancement of the Plantac̃on in those parts.*

1. ffirst, that, in the Citty of Bristoll and Exon, and in the Townes of Plymouth, Dartmouth, Waymouth, and Barnstable, there shalbe a Treasouro^{r} in either of them, togeather wth certayne Comission^{rs} chosen by the Adventurers, To all whome the Tresure, Government, and pollicye of the Trade for New England shall bee Comitted; as alsoe such other officers as shall bee founde convenient for that Service shalbe designed to their ꝑticuler Charge.

2. And, for the better Government of the Said affaires: It is further ordered that there shalbee chosen xviij Comissioners out of the Adventurers of the Citty of *Bristol* and the ꝑts therevnto adioyning, and xviij out of the Citty of *Exon* and the ꝑts therevnto adioyning, and xij out of the Towne of *Plimouth* and the ꝑts therevnto adioyning, and xij out of the Towne of *Dartmouth* and th^{e} ꝑts therevnto adioyning, and xij out of the Towne of *Barnstable* and th^{e} ꝑts therevnto adioyning; out of w^{ch} nomber they are to choose their Treasouro^{r} for eu^{r}y of the said places: And they soe chosen to nominate their Register, Auditors, Clarke, and other Officers.

3. And it is further ordered that the Treasouro^{rs} and Commission^{rs} (being so chosen by the Company of Adventurers of the Seu^{r}all Citties and Townes Corporate, or the greater ꝑte of them that shalbee present) shall receyve their comission for the Manad[g]ing of their affaires from

---

[1] *Book of Trade, 1598–1693*, ff. 105–109. It will, of course, be understood that the headings which are prefixed to these Bristol documents formed no part of the originals, but were added by the scribe who entered them in the Society's *Book of Trade*. I am greatly indebted to Mr. Pope for the care with which he has corrected the printer's proofs of these documents with the originals.

vs, the President and Counsell, according to his Mat^{s} aucthoritie in that behalfe graunted vnto vs.

4. And it is further provided that none shalbee admitted to bee a Comission^{r} in either of the Citties that shall not putt into the *Capitall* stocke for trade and fishinge of his owne propꝑ goodes [ ][1]: Nor none to bee admitted Comission^{rs} in either of the said townes but hee that shall putt in [ ][1] of his owne propper goodes.

5. The Comission^{rs} thus chosen shall attend their services the space of sixe yeeres; and, at the end thereof, one third ꝑte to bee removed by bills or lotts to be drawne. And soe, after twoe yeeres, a like third ꝑte to bee removed; and soe, from tyme to time, an eleccōn to bee made of new [Commissioners]; and that course to bee contynued eu^{r}y two yeeres, vnlesse there shallbe found other just and reasonable cause, throughe death, sickness, or misdemeano^{r}, of any to be removed, in whose place a new one is to bee chosen.

6. That whosoeu^{r} intends to trade in those Territories of *New England* must resolue to putt in his adventure into the Comon Stocke of one of these Citties or Townes Corporate, togeather wth the rest, to be managed by the Treasouro^{r} and Comission^{rs} for the publique good of the Adventurers.

7. That, in case it shall be free for eu^{r}y one, of what qualitie or condicōn soeu^{r}, to putt in his said adventure from ffive pounds to ffive Thousand pounds, or more, as he please: And, after thend of eu^{r}y voyadge, to receyve his gaine or losse as it shall fall out.

8. And, for that there canne be noe certeyne vse made of any trad or other comoditie ariseing wthin those Countryes wthout the safetie of their goods and ꝑsone that shall resort thither and assurance of those territories against any attempt of forraine princes or the Barberus people natives; w^{ch} securitie is to bee attayned by erecting forts, placeing of Garrisons, maynteyninge shipps of warr uppon the Coasts, and officers for the more safe and absolute Government of those parts (matters not to bee accomplished butt wth exceeding greate Charges): It is, therefore ordered towards the defraing of this Charge that, out of the first Capitall adventure, there is to be deducted the tenth penny, soe as the Treasouro^{rs} and Comission^{rs} are to account to the Adventurers but for nyne ꝑts of the said adventure, the tenth penny being defaulted, as is aforesaid, togeather wth the proceeds thereof, and to be accounted for to vs the President and Counsell for the affaires of New England.

9. That eu^{r}y yeere, about Michaelmas and Easter, there shall bee a Generall Meeting at *Teuerton*,[2] in the County of Devon, of the said seu^{r}all Citties and Townes, whether they are to send three out of either Cittie and twoe out of either towne, to resolve uppon their Mutuall proceedings; as, namely, to what Porte or ꝑts of those Territories they will send any shipp or shipps, and what marketts are fittest to vent their comodities in, and what shipps are meetest to goe vnto those marketts; as, alsoe, whether the whole shall proceed uppon a Joincte Stocke or that eu^{r}y Cittie and Towne doe proceed uppon their seu^{r}all adventures, w^{ch} by all meanes is conceyved to bee the worst, both for the publique and private [good]:

---

[1] Blanks are left for these amounts in the document itself.

[2] Undoubtedly Tiverton was chosen as the place of the half-yearly meetings because (though not one of the cities and towns named) it was more or less centrally situated and easily reached from all of them.

10. And, if any thinge shall happen at the said meeting disputable betweene the said Comissionrs, not to be determined betweene themselves, that, in such case, uppon knowledg thereof given vnto vs, the President and Counsell, such an order shall be setled by vs as shall agree wth equity and indifferency to all ꝑties.

11. If, in Case any of the Commissionrs in either of these Citties or Townes shall bee found negligent in the ꝑformance of their orders or duties, vppon Certificat made thereof to vs, the President and Counsell, such further Course shalbee taken for reformac̄on as shall bee found behoofull in tht behalfe, agreable to Equity and Justice.

12. It is likewise provided that, some three months before the deꝑture of eury shipp or shipps, there shalbee notice given of their names and burthens vnto vs, the President and Counsell, togeather wth the names of their Maisters, as alsoe howe farre forth they are able, wthout hinderance to their other ymployments, to helpe wth the transportac̄on of men and other necessaries for the supplie of the Plantac̄on; vppon receipte whereof, a Comission for the proceedinge of the said shipp shalbee sent vnto them.

13. It is further ordered that none shall goe into those ꝑts as a passenger to plante or inhabite before hee bee therevnto lycenced by vs, the President and Counsell.

14. And it is likewise ordered that the Captaine or Mr of the Shipps ymployed to those ꝑts wth any passengers shall, before their coming from thence, bring Certificat vnder the hands and seals of the Governor and other Commanders for the time being, what ꝑsons he lefte there, and of what qualitie or condic̄on they weare; the wch hee shall deliur to the Treasouror, to bee recorded in that Citty from whence he was ymployed, and the Coppie thereof to be sent vnto vs, the President and Counsell.

15. That, in one moneth after the setting out of any, the Accountes bee Audited wthin the same seurall Cittie or Towne, that the charge may bee knowne; And that the Accounts bee read at their publique Courts or meetings.

16. That, wthin two moneths after the end of every voyadge, the accounts be Audited and levelled, and the gaines or losse made knowne and published at the said Courts.

17. That whosoeur desires to receyve his profitts arising out of his adventures, hee is to repaire to the Register of the names of the *Adventurers*, and to receyve under his hand a noate of his adventure directed to the Auditors, from whome he is to receyve the accounte of his Retorne, wch shalbee a Warrant to the Treasouror to pay the same vppon his acquittance and discharge for so much receyved.

18. The Treasouror[s] and Receyver[s] appointed by the Comissioners for the said Company of Adventurors shall bee answered for by them that soe choose them, or otherwise they to take sufficient securitie of them for making good the Cash they shall be intrusted wth.

19. And, for that it is thoughte fitt that those that labor for the publique should receyve some thing towards their expence and travell: It is further ordered that they shall have allowed vnto them one in the hundred of all goods goeing out or coming in for the defrayment of all Charges ariseing as well for travell as otherwise, as they are publique srvants; And this to bee distributed at the discrec̄on of the Treasoror and the greater ꝑte of the Comissionrs assembled at their ordinary meetings.

20. And it is further ordered that the Comissionrs shall not sell nor deliver any shipp or goods vnto the Company of their owne before the

same be prayzed by eighte or nyne of the nomber of the said Adventuro^{r}s w^{ch} are not Comission^{r}s belonging to that Citty or Towne.

21. And these Comission^{r}s are likewise to take into their Consideracon what prizes it is fitt to sett vpon any Comodities that the Inhabitants and Planters in New England shall have gotten through their owne industry and labo^{r}, and in what manner they are to receyve satisfaccon for the same, and also to take care they are not exacted vppon in any sorte.

22. ffor the better supplie of the said *Plantacon*, the said Comission^{r}s shall endeavo^{r} to furnishe the seu^{r}all Townes or Habitacons in New England wth all kind of necessary tradesmen, whoe shall (either as publique servants for the Company or otherwise), according to their discreccons, bee able from time to time to furnishe the said places with necessary provisions vppon reasonable condicons.

23. It is further ordered that the Commissioners, Treasouro^{r}s, and officers shall be solemly be [*sic*] sworne by some of the Counsell th^{t} shall be assigned, truely and faithfully to put into execution their endeavo^{rs}, according to their vttermost skill, for the good and most profitt of the Adventurors, and their true and their true [*sic*] and faithful dealing in all things wherein they are intrusted.

24. And it is further ordered that eu^{r}y shipp of three score tons shall carry wth them twoe Piggs, two Calves, twoe couple of tame Rabbetts, two couple of Hens, and a cocke, w^{ch} they shall deliu^{r} at the Iland of *Menethiggen*,[1] to the hands of such as shall be assigned to receive them, for the use of the Colony.

25. And, for the Greater benefitt of the M^{r}chants and Adventurers in the Course of Trade: It is further ordered by vs, the President and Counsell, that the Comission^{r}s shall contracte wth the M^{rs} of the shipps that are to goe in the first fleete to leave in the said country the fifte [?] Man of their fishing Company, togeather wth the necessary provisions for the fishing Crafte, as also Victualls, vntill the retorne of the fleete (whoe shall bee furnished by vs wth saulte at reasonable prizes), to followe their fishing courses, the better to better to [*sic*] make triall of all the seasons of the yeare, as alsoe to make provision for the lading of some shipps as soon as the next fleete or shipping shall arryve.

26. Vppon Retorne of any of the said shipps, the Captaine or M^{r} thereof shall repayre to such of the Counsell of New England as are next resident vnto them, to whome they shall give an accounte of their voyadge and other accidents happening, that the same may bee Certified to vs, the President and Counsell.

27. ffurther, if it shall happen that any, contrary to the treaties of trade and commerce, shall offer to crosse the proceedings of such as shall bee ymployed into those parts: It shall bee lawful, according to his Ma^{ties} aucthoritie in that behalfe granted, to repell, and by all meanes and wayes to resist, the same.

28. As for the *Capitall Stock* for the setling of the Plantacon, it is intended it shall be paid vnto the hands of the Treasour^{or} belonging to vs, the President and Counsell for the said Affaires of New England, and by him to be disbursed, according to order in that behalfe to bee provided.

29. That every man that desires to have any possession of land in the said Territories is to putt in his adventure into the said Treasury, and soe to take of him a bill of receipte for the same, for w^{ch} hee is to receyve

---

[1] Monhegan, no doubt.

after the rate of one hundred acres for eu^{r}y single share of tenne pounds, to dispose thereof at his discrecc̃on. And for eu^{r}y man that shall goe vppon his owne charge to have, in like manner, one hundred acres for his share ratably, vppon like condic̃ons, payeng twoe shillings ꝑ an̄n for eu^{r}y hundred acres, as chiefe rent to the President and Counsell; w^{ch} lands shall bee assured vnto them vnder the Great Seale of the said President and Counsell.

30. Those that shall determine or are desirous to settle a private plantac̃on vppon their owne or their friends private adventure shall have allowed vnto them, under the Seale aforesaid, for eu^{r}y ꝑson soe by them transported to plant one hundred acres of land, payeng, as aforesaide, for the same, to the President and Counsell, two shillings ꝑ ann, for eu^{r}y hundred acres, And shall likewise enioy such other priviledge as are agreeable to his worth or habillity.

The letter from the Privy Council and the foregoing "Articles and Orders" were probably delivered to the Mayor of Bristol by Sir Ferdinando Gorges towards the end of September (1621). At the same time, or perhaps a few days later, Gorges had a more or less formal conference with some of the leading merchants of the city, as will appear hereafter. At this conference, the terms upon which the Council for New England would be willing to grant licenses to individual merchants to fish along the New England coast were discussed. The larger question (as to the proposals contained in the "Articles and Orders") seems to have been no more than broached; but Gorges left having received a promise from the merchants that they would give the scheme due consideration and would communicate their decision to him as soon as possible. Having waited a fortnight or three weeks and heard nothing, Gorges, on October 12th, wrote from Ashton Court[1] (where he appears to have been staying) to the mayor (the before-mentioned Mr. Robert Rogers) to express his surprise that the merchants had not communicated their decision to him. His rather obscurely-worded letter, sent specially by the hand of one of his servants, forms the third of the documents preserved at Bristol and runs as follows:[2]

[III.] *S^{r} fferdinand Gorge his letter to the Major of Bristoll concerning the said letter and articles.*

To the right woo^{l} my very
Loving frind, M^{r} Rob̃te Rogers,
Mayo^{r} of Bristoll, give theis.

Sir,—

The Paines and Care I have taken to make yo^{r} Citty ꝑtaker of the benifitts that, by Gods favo^{r} and the industrious labor and Charge of others, have bine discou^{r}ed, doth sufficiently declare the good affecc̃on I bare you; and, therefore, I shall not and at this present [? attempt] to vse other arguments for proofe thereof: onely I hould it straung that, haveing stand this longe for answer to the Lords letters and the orders left wth some of you, I have not yet heard from you or any of them. But it may be these offices are conceyved to bee rather of necessity for some private ends, then out of a voluntary disposic̃on to doe a publique good: if it bee so, I canne sooner ꝑdon their errors that are guiltye of that cryme then tell howe to reforme their natures. In a word, I desire of you to give mee acknowledgement vnder yo^{r} hand that you have receyved the letter, and that the Marchants have taken notice of the orders thereby expressed; the w^{ch} I desire you to send mee by this bearer, my Servant, whome I have caused to attend you on purpose for it. And even so, wth many thancks for yo^{r} kind enterteynm^{t}, I comit you to Gods Holy Protecc̃on and will alwayes rest

---

[1] The splendid mansion of Ashton Court, standing about three miles southwest from Bristol, belonged at this period to Sir Hugh Smyth, Knight, whose descendants still own it. His wife was Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Sir Thomas Gorges, Knight. After Sir Hugh's death in 1627, Sir Ferdinando Gorges married his widow.

[2] *Book of Trade, 1589–1693*, fo. 109.

Your very Loving frind,
FFERÑD GORGE

From Ashton,
Octob. 12th 1621.

The mayor promptly replied to the letter of Sir Ferdinando, for he wrote the very next day, October 13th. He had (he says) delivered the letter from the Privy Council and the "Articles and Orders" to the Society of Merchant Venturers, which body had met, only two days previously, to consider them. The Merchants had (continues the mayor) found the Articles so "difficult" that, on the spur of the moment and in the absence from home of many of their leading members, they could do nothing in respect of them, but they would like further conference with Sir Ferdinando upon the matter. Nevertheless (added the mayor), the merchants hoped that if, in the meantime, any of them desired to send fishing vessels to the New England coast, they would be allowed to do so on their promising to pay to the company a percentage on their profits. Here is what the mayor said in full:[1]—

[IV.] *The Major's answere to Sir ffer dinand Gorge, in the behalfe of the Generalty, touching his demaund.*

Sir,

The letter of the Lords of his Ma^{ts} most honorable privie counsell, togeather wth the Articles concerning the affaires of New England, w^{ch} I receyved from you, I have deliu^{r}ed to the M^{r} and Company of M^{r}ch'ts of this citty; whoe, for answere therevnto, have informed mee that, at their gen^{r}all assembly twoe dayes past, they ꝑvsed the contents thereof and doe finde the said Articles so dificult that, at ꝑsent, they cannot conclude, in regard of the shortnes of tyme to them allotted and for that many of their Company experienced in the like affaires are nowe from whome. Those w^{ch} are here intended to have had some conferrence wth your selfe, and to that end did send a speciall messenger to your Inne in Bristoll, where hee spake wth one of your servants, who reported that you would bee here the next morning, for w^{ch} cause they deferred their answer vntill yo^{r} coming. And nowe, seeing that your business will not ꝑmitt you, the matter being of great consequence and concerning as well other places as this City, they determined not to doe any thing for the gen^{r}all wthout further deliberac̄on and also advise of the Adventurers of the other Ports, wth whome they meane to confer. Onely they desire that if, in the meane time, any ꝑticuler men of their Company shall set forthe any shipping on a fishing voyadg for that Country, then to allowe you an indifferent rate, ꝑporc̄oning the same by the tonne, or otherwise, as shall be agreed vppon; w^{ch}, yf you please to entertayne, some two of them will repaire vnto you, or els send you answer thereof wth all expedic̄on, either to Plymouth or London; and soe, having not elce to enlarge for [at this] present,

---

[1] *Book of Trade, 1589–1693*, fo. 110.

doe rest,

Yo^{r} Loving frind,

[Robert Rogers]

Bristoll, this
xiijth of October 1621.

But the Bristol merchants were astute business men. With the cumbrous scheme propounded by the Council for New England, they would have nothing to do; but they did want a share in the fisheries along the coast; and, in order to ascertain the most advantageous terms on which the latter could be secured, they decided to temporize. Accordingly, while their mayor was in correspondence with Sir Ferdinando, nine of the leading merchants communicated on their own account with their parliamentary representatives in London, Mr. John Whitson and Mr. John Guy.[1] In their letter (which here follows), the merchants recited all that had taken place, enclosed copies of the documents which they had received, and desired their colleagues in London to procure a copy of the New England Company's patent and ascertain from it privately whether the Company's rights and privileges really were such as Sir Ferdinando Gorges had represented them to be; for (they explained) some of their number were inclined to accept the terms on which a license to fish was offered if satisfied that those terms really were the best obtainable. They write:[2]

[V.] *The Companyes letter to Mr. Whitson, Mr. Guy, and others at London, to certify them of the busines of Sir Ferdinand Gorge.*

Woor^{ll} Sirs.—

Our love to you remembered, &c. Here hath bine lately Sir ffardinand Gorge, knight, wth letters from the Lords of his Mat^{s} most honorable privie Counsell directed to the Mayo^{rs} of Bristoll, Exon, Plimouth, and other places, thereby requiring them to signifie vnto such of his Mat^{s} Subiects inhabiting neere the said Coasts whome it doth concern that noe p^{r}son should presume to attempt or doe any thinge to prejudice or hinder the President and Counsell of New England in their trade and Plantac̄on in those ꝑts: The tenor of w^{ch} letter, togeather with certeyne Articles concluded on by the said President and Counsell, wee have related vnto the Company of M^{r}chants and Owners of this Porte at a generall assemblie; whoe in no sorte doe like of the said Articles, being they concerne the establisheing and making of a Joincte Company Stocke throughout all the Westerne ꝑts to be ordered and governed by the said President and Counsell; whereof wee have given him to vnderstand and alsoe of our determinac̄on not to doe any thinge for the gen^{r}all wthout further deliberac̄on and advice; yet, in regard that the Newfoundland fishing hath fayled of late yeeres, here are some that are forward to make triall of that new fishing; and, to that purpose (the knighte being present at o^{r} assembly), [they] did demaund whether the said President and Counsell had power to restraine vs from fishing on those Coasts; who answered[1] that it was not soe menc̄oned in the patent, but that the whole land from forty to fortie eighte degrees Northerly latitude, lyeng on the Coaste of *America*, was graunted wth all priviledges belonging to free Lords, and that there could be noe fishing wthout the vse of the land, w^{ch} wee could not ꝑtake of wthout his allowance;[2] wherevpon, it was demaunded what hee would require of vs for a shippe of one hundred tonnes to be sent thither on fishing and onely to make [such] vse of the land there as is made in Newfoundland; whoe at first demaunded tenne ꝑ cent of o^{r} adventure, to be valued as well on the shipping as otherwise; but, after much debating of the matter, hee came to this pointe:—that, for eu^{r}y thirtie tonnes of shipping that wee should send thither, hee would have a man carried over and landed there, with the value of tenne pounds to bee layd out in such provision as should bee appointed, only the charge of the man's goeing over to be deducted; and soe accordingly for eu^{r}y thirtie tons of shipping, or else to pay tenne pounds in money for eu^{r}y thirtie tons of shipping w^{ch} wee shall send thither, the w^{ch} will amount to ffiftie pounds charge vppon a shippe of one hundred and fiftie tons; vppon w^{ch} termes, the setter forth or furnisher of the said shipp shall alwayes after have libertie to set forth that ship, or any other ship of the like burthen wthout payeng any other duty or thinge to the said President and Counsell; for w^{ch} his demaunds hee hath given vs time to consider of. Nowe, good sirs, seing that here are some whoe are willing to adventure that way, our request vnto you is, in the behalf of the Citty in gen^{r}all, that you wilbee pleased to procure a coppie of the letters pattents graunted vnto the said President and Counsell of New England (w^{ch}, as the knighte sayth, was lately confirmed againe aboute this time twelve moneth), and that you would alsoe ꝑvse the contents thereof, to know if he hath any power to restraine our fishing on those coasts, and to write vs your opinion thereof. ffor, if they have power to restraine, here are some that are willing, for their peaceable goeing thither, to give [i. e., *pay*] the demaund aforesaid; whereof wee desire your opinion, as alsoe what you conceyve is fittest to be done for the quiet enioying of the said fishing trade. And, for the charge that you shall be at in the premisses, it shall bee borne by the Company in genrall. The Coppie of the said letter and Articles wee send you here wth to ꝑvse; and so, haveing not else to enlarge for the ꝑsent, [we] doe comitt you to the proteccon of the Almightie, and doe rest

---

[1] John Whitson, alderman, and formerly mayor, of Bristol, was elected member of Parliament for the city on November 11, 1605, and sat through several parliaments. He was one of the chief of those who, in 1603, sent Captain Martin Pring on a voyage to the coast of New England; and Pring, on this occasion, named a certain bay after him. John Guy, also an alderman of Bristol, was returned as member for that city on January 16, 1620–21, and he continued to sit through several parliaments.

[2] *Book of Trade, 1589–1693*, fo. 111.

---

[1] That is, "the knight" (Sir Ferdinando Gorges) answered.

[2] It is not very easy to follow Gorges in this statement. The exclusive right of fishing, both on the mainland and islands and in the seas adjoining, was (contrary to this declaration by Gorges) specifically granted to the company under its charter, as already shown. Possibly an explanation of his statement is to be found in the fact that strong objection had been raised to the granting of this exclusive right, and arrangements had been made, though they were never carried out, for the granting of a new charter, from which it was probably intended to omit the grant of this exclusive right.

Yor loving frinds,
JOHN LANGTON,
RICHARD HOLWORTHIE,
Mr LONGE,
HUMFRY HOOKE,
THOMAS WRIGHT,
HUMFRY BROWNE,
ANDREW CHARLTON,
WILLm JONES,
WILLm PITT,

Bristoll:
Octob. 1621.[1]

As to the outcome of this correspondence and of the enquiries made by Messrs. Whitson and Guy in London, we know nothing; for the succeeding documents are of later date and relate to entirely different matters. Before noticing them, it will be well to refer briefly to certain other records preserved elsewhere, which carry on (allowing for a gap of seven months—from November 1621 to May 1622) the history of the Council's proceedings.

So far as is known with certainty, all the *original* documents recording the proceedings of the Council for New England are lost, with the exception, perhaps, of one or two patents granted by the Council. There exist, however, three more or less contemporaneous documents which appear to be *copies* of portions of the original minutes of proceedings at meetings of the Council. Two of these documents require to be noticed here.

The most important of these documents is a manuscript book in the possession of Mrs. Carew, of Crowcombe Court, Somersetshire,[2] in the beginning of which are neatly entered the minutes of thirty-seven meetings of the Council held between May 31, 1622, and June 29, 1623. It is quite possible that this may be the *actual* minute-book of the company, and not a copy; but, if this is the case, it is not easy to explain why the minutes of later meetings were not entered on the remaining leaves, now blank; and the evenness of the writing seems against the idea that the minutes were entered at different times, as meetings were held. Whether the original or a copy, it is certainly of contemporary date.

---

[1] The imperfect date has been added in another hand, which belongs, apparently, to a slightly later period.

[2] Crowcombe Court was built by John Carew, Esquire, about the year 1615.

The second document appears to be a copy of the foregoing, though it shows slight verbal differences (perhaps due to errors of the copyist) and lacks several leaves at the end—those on which the last two meetings (held on June 28 and 29, 1623) were, doubtless, recorded. This document is, perhaps, as much as half a century later in date than the events it records, and is, therefore, certainly not an original.[1]

The third document mentioned above must be reserved for later notice.

The meetings recorded in the two documents here noticed were evidently the first formal meetings held by the company for the transaction of business. Earlier meetings there certainly were, as already stated; but they were probably of an informal character and the minutes of them (if any were kept) were probably mere memoranda made on loose slips of paper. With the meeting held on May 31, 1622, however, regular meetings commenced; for thereafter we hear in the minutes of the election of a governor (Sir Ferdinando Gorges), a treasurer (Dr. Barnabe Goche, of Exeter), a clerk (Mr. William Boles), and other officers; while a box in which to preserve the company's papers was ordered to be provided; negotiations were opened with the Earl of Salisbury for the hire of rooms, to serve as the head-quarters of the company, in the New Exchange; and other business incidental to the commencement of the company's operations was transacted. Among the more miscellaneous things done were the granting of several licences to fish on the New England coast and the division among individual members of a considerable portion of the company's territories. The procuring of a new patent was also a matter which received a great deal of attention. Under date November 11, there occurs a passage which apparently relates to the letter from the Privy Council and the "Articles and Orders" already given:

"It is propounded that th^e^ Orders of th^e^ Lords of th^e^ Privie Councell be putt in print, together with th^e^ Orders for Settling of the trade and

---

[1] This document, which is preserved in the Public Record Office in London (*State Papers, Colonial Series*, Vol. II., No. 6), was printed by Dr. Chas. Deane in 1867 (*Proc. Amer. Antiq. Soc.*, Apr., 1867, pp. 59–96). When the first-mentioned document came to light in 1874 (see the *Fourth Report of the Royal Historical Manuscripts Commission*, p. 370), the same gentleman printed the concluding portion (that on the pages lost from the end of the other document), together with a list of the passages in which the two differ (see *Proc. Amer. Antiq. Soc.*, Oct., 1875, pp. 49–63).

Commerce in New England; and a comand to all Masters of Shipps and their Company to bee sent and fixed by th^{e} Admirall upon the Mayne Mast of every Shipp, to be obedient hereunto."

Three weeks later, under date December 3, 1622, it is recorded that Dr. Barnabe Goche, the treasurer, had left town hurriedly for his house at Exeter, and that he had been authorized to take with him the company's common seal in order that he might be able to grant duly-sealed licences to fish to any of the west-country merchants and owners of ships who might desire to have such. Immediately following, comes this entry:—

"S^{r} Ferd. Gorges is desired to drawe the forme of a letter to bee sent into the Country with the Proclamac̄ons, to this purpose:—That it is not the Councell's meaning to stay or hinder any from goeing to New England in fishing voyages, so as they will conforme themselves to such orders as are concluded and agreed on by the Councell and committed to Dr. Barn: Goche, Treăr, to whom they may repayre at Exon, in Devon, for their commissions in that behalfe."

This passage enables us to assign a precise date to the next document (No. VI.) preserved at Bristol, which (though undated) is unquestionably the letter Sir Ferdinando Gorges drew up in accordance with the desire of his colleagues. It runs:[1]—

[VI.] *The Counsell of New England theire letter to the Mayor of Bristoll concerninge their intent to grant lisense to trade on those Coasts, notwithstanding his Ma^{ties} proclamac̄on on theire behalfe to the contrary.*

To the right Woo^{rll}
our very Loving frend,
the Major of the City
of Bristoll.

After o^{r} hartie comendac̄ons:—

Whereas his Ma^{tie} hath bine moved, vppon deliberat considerac̄on and advice of the Lords of his M. privie Counsell, by his Princely Proclamac̄ons (for the reasons therein expressed) strictly to prohibite any from frequenting or visiting the Coasts of New England or entermedling with the trade or comerce wth the Natives wthout lycence of the Counsell for those affaires, as by the said Proclamac̄ons doth and may appeare: But, for that it is not thereby intended to debar any Regular or Honest [person] from a free recourse to those ꝑts, so farre forth as they will conforme themselves to those reasonable condic̄ons and iust and lawfull orders that are thought fitt to bee established for the saftie of the Inhabitants there already setled and better advancem^{t} of that Plantac̄on: To w^{ch} end, the Counsell for those affaires have directed their Comission to *Doctor Barnabe Goche*, Treasouro^{r} for that busines, and others therein menc̄oned, resident at Exon or thereabouts, to Graunt lycences to any desirous to goe as aforesaid: Whereof we haue bine moved to give you ꝑticuler knowledge, that any that way affected may vnderstand whether to repaire for his dispatch, wthout further trouble or charge: And for that cause wee pray you to make the same knowne to those of yo^{r} Towne

---

[1] *Book of Trade, 1598–1693*, fo. 123.

[who are] that way inclyned, wherein you shall doe them a Comon Curtesie. Soe shall you finde vs ready to requite the same: And thus, not doubting of your care herein, wee comitt you to Gods Holy Proteccon and ever rest

Yo^r very Loving frends,
E. GORGES,
FARD. GORG,
SAMUELL ARGALL,
Will Boles

[December 1622.]

It will be worth while here to refer to the terms of the royal proclamation,[1] bearing date November 6, 1622, copies of which were sent out (as appears) with the foregoing letter. It forbids all subjects, not adventurers, inhabitants or planters in New England, to visit its coasts or trade there, save by licence from the Council for New England or according to certain orders of the Privy Council for the benefit of the Virginia colony.

The next two documents (Nos. VII. and VIII.) belong almost certainly to the same period. They were evidently drawn up in order to induce colonists to go to the colony and capitalists to invest money therein. The second of the two is very brief and, judging from its heading, was probably intended as a sort of addendum to the longer document. Both are very curious. They run as follows: —

[VII.] *Reasons showing the Benefitt that may ensue to these his Mat^s Realmes by settling of the Plantacon in New England, and especially to the Western pts of this Kingdome.*

1. ffirst, it enlargeth the bounds of his Ma^ts dominions and annexeth vnto his crowne one of the goodlyest Territories for Soyle, Havens, Harbours, and Habitable Islands that ever hath bine discovered by our nation.
2. Secondly, it will affoord a world of ymploym^t to many thousands of o^r Nation of all sorts of people whoe are (wee knowe) at this present ready to Starve for want of it.
3. Thirdly, it will thereby disburthen the Comon Wealth of a Multitude of Poore that are likelie daylie to increase, to the infinite trouble and prejudice of the publique state.
4. ffourthlie, it wilbee a marvellous increase to o^r Navigacon and a most excellent oportunitie for the breeding of marrin^rs, for that the vessells that are to trade thither, and soe from thence to their seu^rall m^rketts, are to bee shipps of good burthen [and are] to goe well manned and thoroughly fortified for defence of themselves and their Consorts.
5. ffifthlie, the Clyme being so temperate and helthfull as it is, it will, doubtlesse, afforde in shorte time a notable vent for o^r Clothes and other stuffs of that kinde, w^ch lyes nowe dead vpon o^r m^rchants handes.

---

[1] Printed in Rymer's *Foedera*, XVII. 416, and in Hazard's *Historical Collections*, I. 151.

[2] *Book of Trade, 1593–1693*, ff. 141–143.

6. Sixthly, wee shalbee able to furnishe our selves, out of o^{r} Owne Territories, wth many of those Comodities that nowe we are beholding to our Neighbo^{rs} for :—As, namely, Pitche, Tarre, Rosen, Flaxe, Hemp, Masts, Deales, Spruce, and other Timber of all Sortes ; Salte and Wine (w^{ch} twoe Comodities a lone coste this Kingdome many thousands by the yeere); beside Madder, Oade, and many other dyeng Rootes ; Stuffes and graines ; As, alsoe, seu^{r}all ritche furres ; togeather wth one of the best fishinge in the knowne ꝑte of the world ; and sundry sortes of Apothecary Druggs not yet spoken of.

7. Seaventhlie, for the difficultie of the Enterprise (thankes be to God), it is, in mann^{r}, already past ; for that the whole coast (wthin the lymitts graunted by his Ma^{tie} to the Councell for those affaires) is not onely discovered by their meanes, but many the principall Portes and Ilandes actually possessed by some of the present vndertakers : And whether this yeere hath beene sent, beside those that are nowe in p^{r}parac̄on to goe wth the Governo^{r}, neere aboute 400 men, women, and children,[1] as alsoe 60 sayles of the best shippes of the Westerne ꝑtes that are onely gonne to ffishe and trade for ffurres.

8. Eightly, the Soyle being soe fertile and the Clyme soe helthfull, wth what content shall the ꝑticuler ꝑson ymploy himselfe there when hee shall finde that, for 12$^{l.}$ 10$^{s.}$ adventure, hee shalbee made Lord of 200 acres of Land, to him and his heires for ever : And, for the charge of transportac̄on of himselfe, his familye, and Tenn̄ts, hee shalbee alotted for eu^{r}y ꝑson hee carries 100 acres more, at the rate of 5$^{s.}$ for eu^{r}y C. acres chiefe rent to the Lords of the soyle in whose land he shall happen to sitt downe : And what Laborer soeu^{r} shall transporte himselfe thither at his owne charge to have the like proporc̄on of Land vpon the aforesaid condic̄ons and bee sure of ymploym^{t} to his good content for his present maintenance.

9. Nynthly, yf hee bee a gentleman or ꝑson of more Eminency whoe hath no greate Stocke to contynue his reputac̄on here att home, how happie shall hee bee yf hee can make but a matter of 100$^{l.}$ or 200$^{l.}$ providentially ymployed in the course of his transportac̄on who shalbee therewth able to transporte himselfe, his familye, and necessarie provisions, and soe have alotted vnto him a quantety of Lande, wherewth hee shall not onely be able to lyve wthout scorne of his Malignors but in a plentiful and worthie manner, wth assurance to leave to [*sic*] good ffortunes to his posteritie, yf hee but industriously bee carefull to make the best of his meanes.

10. Tenthlie, seeing that the Councell for those affaires have eu^{r} had, and still have, a speciall desire in this their Courses truely and wthout vanitie or ostentac̄on to endeavo^{r} the good of the Countrie, for the better declarac̄on and manifestac̄on whereof they are freely content, and doe hartily wishe that eu^{r}y Country[2] wthin this Realme would be pleased to take a certeyne proporc̄on of Lande wthin their Lymitts, w^{ch} they shall have at 5$^{s.}$ Rent the 100 Acres, wth Allowance of some 1000 acres wthout Rent to be ymployed for pious vses, whether they might send from yeere to yeere such of their people as might conveniently [be] spared and that are otherwise like to be burthensome vnto the State of the Comon Wealth ; w^{ch} may bee incorporated into one body and governed vnder such officers and Majestrates as please them that send such

---

[1] If this statement is correct, the number of those who went to New England at this period must have been much greater than is commonly supposed.

[2] Undoubtedly *county* was intended.

as they ymploy, who shalbee strengthned w^th^ such Liberties and imunities as shalbee thought fitt for the better advancem^t^ of that service : Soe may the County not onely from themselves [*sic*] to relieve the state of their poorer sorte of people but finde worthie ymploym^t^ for many younger brothers and brave gentlemen that nowe are ruined for want thereof.

[*11.*] Lastly, and above all the rest, by this opertunitye, there is noe Countie w^th^in this Realme but by this Course hath a speciall occasion and meanes presented vnto them to dedicate their best service to the God of Heaven and Earth, by endeavouring to advance his glory in seeking howe to settle the Christian ffaith in those hethenishe and desert places of the World ; w^ch^ whoe shall refuse to further, lett him vndergoe the blame thereof himselfe.

[VIII.] *Certeyne breif Reasons that are thought fitt to bee propounded to the Westerne Counties to move them to the furthering of the Plantation of New England.*

That, yf it shall seem sutable to the affeccons of the Countie in gen^r^all, the vndertakers are content to a lott a Competent proporcon of Land, both w^th^in the Mayne and vpon the sea coast, where the Governo^r^ shall settle such *Numbers* of people vnder Commaunders and Officers as th^t^ Countie shall thincke fitt to furnishe w^th^ provisions and shipping necessary for such a work, and the profitts and benifitts of their ymploym^t^ to bee for ever appropryated to their vses that soe send them, for the good of that Countye.

Yf this Course bee not liked, that then whosoever in ꝑticuler will send any nomber of tenñts or servants of his owne, and soe bee at the Charge to furnishe and supplie them from time to time as cause shall require, hee shall, in like sorte, have a proporcon of Land alotted vnto him to make his best profitt as hee shall thincke good.

But, for that neither of these may as yett ꝑadventure be held a fitt Course vntill a setled governem^t^ bee there established, then, for the present advancem^t^ thereof, lett eu^r^y free harte and generous spiritt that have either religion or noblenesse contribute towarde the present vndertaking now in hand in what kind of provision soever he is most willing or best able.

The last two of the Bristol documents (Nos. IX. and X.) are just a year later in date than the foregoing. They are also some six months later than the date (June 1623) of the last meeting of the Council recorded in the two documents preserved elsewhere and already alluded to. We have, therefore, no extraneous information to throw light on the circumstances under which these two concluding documents were drawn up ; but their object is self-evident. Clearly, the New England Company, finding that its schemes were not flourishing and that its colony was making little progress, decided to make one more effort to interest others, and especially those of the west-country, in its undertaking. With this end in view, the company persuaded the King to address a letter to the Earl of Pembroke, lord lieutenant of Somersetshire,[1] urgently desiring him to do all in his power to further the interests of the colony in New England by bringing it under the notice of all residing in the county of Somerset or the city of Bristol who were at all likely to care to help in forwarding the work in hand. The earl was, no doubt, willing enough to comply with the King's request; for, as one of the original patentees, he was an interested party. The King's letter to him runs as follows:[1]—

---

[1] William (Herbert) third earl of Pembroke, son of Henry the second earl, was born in 1580 and succeeded to the title in 1601. After the accession of James I., he took an

[IX.] *His Ma^{ties} Letter to the Lo: Lieutenant and his Deputies of the County of Somerset and Citty of Bristol to moue others to joyne in the Plantac̄on of New England*

James Rex.

To our righte trustie and right
welbeloved Cosen and Councellor,
Will^{m} Earle of Pembrooke, Chamb^{r}leyn of o^{r} Household and our Lieutenant of o^{r} Countie of Som^{r}set and
Citty of Bristol, and to o^{r} trusty and
welbeloved the Deputy Lieutenants and
Justices of Peace of the same County
and Citty.

Right trustie and right welbeloved Cousen and Councelor, and trustie and welbeloved: Wee greete you well.

Wee have formerly graunted o^{r} Royall Charter for the Plantinge of a Collonie in the ꝑte of New England, w^{ch} was not passed wthout due examinac̄on of the Propisic̄on then made and apparent assurance of good and worthie successe by that Plantac̄on for the advancem^{t} of Christian Religion and a good addic̄on, both of Honor and Profitt, vnto o^{r} Kingdomes and people. And, because, vpon the tryall that hath beene made by some ꝑsons of quallitie that have bine Content, for the publique good, to adventure their private estates and fortunes, the benefitts and comodities founde in those ꝑts and the good retornes that have beene made from thence do approve the vndertaking to be of such Publique Hopes and consequenc as wee thincke it verie worthie of o^{r} care and assistance in any thing that may give a real furtherance therevnto: And that, accordinglie, wee have taken into o^{r} considerac̄on that so greate a worke cannot well bee mannadged to the best advantage wthout the helpe of more handes and strength then are ymployed in it: We have first thought vpon those Westerne Countries in respecte of the scituac̄on and convenciencie (both for receyving the Comodities from the Plantac̄on, sending such provisions and supplies thither as shalbee requisite, and takeing an accompte of both to be the most proper and fitt to have a share and interest in that business), Not doubting but y^{t}, being pursued wth an assistance from thence, the successe and retornes will be soe beneficiall

---

active part in public life. He took a great interest in all schemes of exploration and colonization and was among the promoters of the Virginia Company (1609), the Northwest Passage Company (1612), the New East India Company (1614), the Bermudas Company (1615), the New England Company (1620), and the Guiana Company (1627). By some he is supposed to have been the "Mr. W. H." to whom some of Shakespeare's sonnets are addressed. He died in 1630.

[1] *Book of Trade, 1598–1693*, ff. 144–145.

as will not only y[1] charge in a good measure of profitt but drawe in other countries[1] voluntarylie to offer themselves ꝑtn'rs therein: The Experience wee have had of your affecons to publique works doth likewise move vs the rather to invite you both by yo' owne adventures and indeavouring to move other Gentlemen and ꝑsons of quallitie and meanes in that Countye to joyne wth you in the advancemen' of this Plantacon, wch wee doe not onely propound vnto you as a worke wherein the Publique hath a greate interest but wherein yo' adventures are in all appearance like to bring you good retornes of profitt, wch the Pattentees will more ꝑticularly make appeare vnto you by some Ministers of theirs appointed to attend you for that purpose. Wee hope wee shall not neede to vse much ꝑswasion in this ꝑticular, where both publique and private consideracons haue soe much force and yo' good affeccons soe ready to farther good workes. Nevertheles, wee doe expecte to receyve from you an accompte of yo' proceedinges and an intimacon thereby whome you finde ready and willing and whome not, that wee may [? take] such notice of both as there shalbee cause.

Given at Or Pallace at Westminster, the Eighth day of December in the one and twentieth yeere of or Raigne of England, ffrance, and Ireland, and of Scotland the seaven and fifteth [1623].

The Earl of Pembroke promptly complied with the King's request. On December 13, he wrote to the mayor of Bristol (and, doubtless, to others within the county) enclosing a copy of the King's letter and requesting action to be taken thereon. The mayor no doubt communicated copies of both to the Society of Merchant Venturers, which accounts for their appearance among the Society's records. The earl's letter follows :[2]—

[X.] *The Lo: Lieutenant his Letter to the Mayor of Bristoll, informeing him of his Maties letter, and withall desiringe notice of their resolucon, whereby hee may giue accompt thereof to his Matie when hee shall be required.*

After my verie hartie comendacons.

Whereas it hath pleased his Matie to take into his Royall Consideracon the setling and advancem' of the Plantacon of *New England*, and to that purpose haveing directed his gracious lres vnto my selfe and my Deputie Lieutennts, I have thought fitt to send you herein closed a Coppie of the said Letters; to the end that, being ꝑticulerly acquainted wth his Maties pleasure and desire therein, you may as well be carefull to give them their due respecte, as alsoe tht you may thereby knowe the better howe to order the course of your proceedings to his Maties content and satisfaccon: Wherein I should bee willing to further your intencons wth my best advice and ꝑswasions, as well for the profitt wch may accrew vnto this Kingdome by soe beneficiall a Trade as this is likelie to bee, as alsoe for the ꝑticuler Comodity, wch may thereby much advantage the City of Bristoll. But you shall receyve such ample direccons from his Mats lres touching the whole course of this busines that I shall nowe onely desire you to bee carefull that you give mee notice of yo' ꝑceedings and resolucons herein, that I may bee able to give an accompt thereof whensoeu^r it shall please his Ma^tie to require it at my hands. And thus, bidding you verye hartilie farewell, I rest

---

[1] Without doubt *counties* is meant here also.

[2] *Book of Trade, 1598–1693*, f. 145.

Your Loving ffrend,
PEMBROOKE.

Whitehall, this xiiij^th
Decemb. 1623.

This is the last of the ten documents preserved at Bristol, so we are left in ignorance as to what steps (if any) the Bristol merchants took in the matter.

At the date of this last document (December 1623), the New England Company was already practically in a moribund condition, though it continued to exist for twelve years longer. Of its proceedings for the next eight years, we have no record; but the events of the closing years of its existence are briefly recorded in the last of the three documents already noticed as existing elsewhere. This is another volume of minutes preserved in the Public Record Office,[1] and is certainly not an original document, being probably a copy of about the same date as the earlier volume of minutes also preserved there. It contains the minutes of twenty-two meetings of the Council held between November 4, 1631, and November 1, 1638—four meetings in 1631, ten in 1632, six in 1635 and two in 1638.[2] There is nothing to explain what has become of the minutes of the meetings held during the eight years and a half which elapsed between June 29, 1622 (when the first of these documents ends) and November 4, 1631 (when this document commences).

The chief business transacted at the fourteen meetings held during 1631 and 1632 was the dividing up of the company's territories among the individual members and the issuing of patents therefor. Of the proceedings during 1633 and 1634, we know nothing; but, in 1635, the company decided to surrender its charter back to the King, having largely failed to carry out its great schemes of colonization, and finding itself powerless to maintain its rights or to preserve order within its territories. The six meetings held in 1635 were chiefly concerned with the details of the surrender. The two meetings held three years later, in 1638, were called to close up the affairs of the company; and, with them, its existence came to an end.

MILLER CHRISTY.

---

[1] *State Papers, Colonial Series*, Vol. IV., No. 29. It has been printed by Dr. Deane in the *Proc. Am. Antiq. Soc.*, April, 1867, pp. 97–131.

[2] It is worthy of note that, although the Council for New England was supposed to have been "established at Plymouth," all its recorded meetings were held in London.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

A History of Greece for High Schools and Academies. By GEORGE WILLIS BOTSFORD, Ph.D., Instructor in the History of Greece and Rome in Harvard University. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1899. Pp. xiii, 381.)

THE real test of a school history is use in the class. If the book in the hands of a good teacher interests pupils, and gives notions of the subject that are correct as far as they go, and so far as young minds can comprehend the complex life of a people, then the book is a good one. Whether it is good in that sense is very hard for one who is not actually teaching such classes to say beforehand. The volume named above receives a distinct character from the fact that in it are combined three traits, which, when thus combined, should go far to make it good in the sense described. These are, first, close adherence to primary sources; second, free use of good translations of ancient Greek authors; and third, illustrations that are for the most part excellent.

It is clear that the author is not merely a compiler. He looks at the subject for himself and knows whereon his belief rests; this, of itself, gives a certain freshness to his pages. A high degree of originality is not to be expected; and occasionally one may question whether, in adopting a view that differs from the traditional one, the author has given due weight to all the evidence. The complete explaining away of what is known as the Dorian migration raises that question distinctly. But the merit of Dr. Botsford's general method outweighs an occasional error in application. The use made of translations from Greek is well exemplified in the account of the battle of Salamis, where Aischylos, in a good verse translation, is allowed to tell about all that is told. One could hardly do better. In like manner good versions from Thukydides, Pindar, Aristophanes, Herodotos, are pressed into service, with excellent effect. Something like direct contact with the sources, and with a great literature, is thus secured. If such pages are a little less easy to question a class upon in the old-fashioned way, the gain is nevertheless apparent. The illustrations are largely process cuts from recent and good photographs, with numerous outline maps and plans. Colors are so applied on the maps as to make the main facts clear, without excess of detail. By such a map the distribution of "Mycenaean" civilization, as revealed by remains, is clearly exhibited; so of the Greek settlements in the age of colonization; two maps present Greece and Persia at the time of their great conflict; others are no less good. Some of the cuts from photographs are too small and indistinct to have any value, but most are good, some strikingly so. The frontispiece is a view of the Athenian Acropolis, in its present condition, taken from nearly east, with the gardens along the Ilissos in the foreground and the columns of the Olympieion at the left. Akrokorinthos, the fort at Phyle, modern Sparta with Mt. Taygetos, are excellent views. Ancient portraits and some famous pieces of sculpture are also shown.

Of course, there are things to criticize. It is not possible to give children any notion of early Greek philosophy, and one had better not attempt it. Some phrases seem to imply a lower idea of the intellectual level of the Greek poets than the author probably intended; to say of Isokrates (p. 290), "His literary style lacked freshness and vigor, but was the perfection of art," implies a false, though common, notion of what constitutes art; on p. 179 the plan of the "Acropolis of Athens" is a partially inaccurate plan of the whole city; the grave *stèle* on p. 122 is older than the battle of Marathon. This last fact Dr. Botsford doubtless knew; but the only hint that the monument cannot represent a "warrior of Marathon" is in the quotation marks enclosing the title. But these are minor blemishes. The book on the whole lays the stress where it should be laid, on "the character and achievements of the great men," "the development of the social and political life," "the spirit of the civilization." As helps in the use of the work are given marginal topics and references to Greek writers; "Sources" and "Modern Authorities" are grouped at the end of each chapter; and in a final chapter, after a brief summary of each period, are some examples of outline studies of special topics, suggestive hints for many similar studies, and a list of events in chronological order. Last is an index, in which proper names are accented.

T. D. GOODELL.

The Medieval Empire. By HERBERT FISHER, Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford. (London: Macmillan and Co. 1898. Two vols., pp. viii, 348; vii, 308.)

NOT since the first appearance of Mr. James Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire* has any one attempted to give in English, or in fact in any other language, so complete and careful a study of the great medieval institution as is here offered. Mr. Fisher deprecates, in almost too modest language, any intention of "trespassing" or "infringing" upon the field of his predecessor, but that field is certainly large enough for two laborers whose methods and aims are so different. Bryce's work was an essay, following a generally chronological scheme and aiming to give a consistent picture of the singular institution it describes. Fisher has discarded the chronological method. He aims at no dramatic consistency and he is not concerned with any theory as to the precise nature of the imperial system. Bryce attempted to cover the whole history of the Empire, even adding a chapter on the present utterly distinct institution of the modern German imperial state. Fisher limits himself quite strictly to its heroic period, the only period in which it deserves any careful study as an empire, the four centuries and a half from Charlemagne to the death of Frederic II.

The method employed throughout is the topical. Each chapter has a certain unity of its own and contributes to the whole in proportion to its own value as a special treatise. The effect is inevitably to produce more or less of repetition and hence of confusion. One may well question, for example, whether the great figure of Barbarossa would not have stood out in clearer relief as an exponent of the imperial theory if he could have been dealt with by himself, under one point of view, instead of appearing as he does here in a dozen different places and in connection with as many different sets of ideas.

Clearness is, of all qualities in the historian, the one most imperatively demanded of every one who touches, no matter how, upon the medieval empire; for of all human institutions none, it may safely be said, is more confusing to the modern reader. Bryce sought to make his subject clear by dwelling on the unities of the Empire; Fisher seeks the same end by bringing out a mass of detail and leaving the final impression to shape itself as it will. He gives up almost entirely any narration of events and tries only to account for the institutional ideas of which the events were but the outward expression.

This method is, so far, heartily to be commended. The problem of the book is to determine, as far as may done, what the Empire meant as distinguished from the several lesser sovereignties included under it. This problem is to be solved by examining what the emperors actually did and what they tried to do in their imperial capacity. An emperor was ordinarily first a German territorial prince, then a king in Germany, hen a king in Italy and a king in Burgundy and he might add any number of lesser dignities—yet no more false definition of his empire could be given than that it was the sum of these several powers. The Empire was an abstraction, a metaphysical entity quite independent of all realities, existing even when there was no emperor, and serving its highest purposes when it appealed to its ideal quality, not when it was doing the most to convert the ideal into a reality. Mr. Fisher is plainly quite conscious of these curious paradoxes in the institution he is studying. They appear from point to point, if one has the eye to pick them out; but it requires a good deal of previous knowledge to steer one's way through the apparent contradictions they suggest.

The fourteen chapters are of uneven excellence and value. The most important are those relating to administration, legislation and finance, and this chiefly because it is along the lines of splendid failure in these respects that the strictly imperialist tendencies of the Middle Ages are most marked. Quite characteristic is the treatment of legislation in Germany where, after sketching at length the attempts of the crown to create a sphere of action for itself, our author closes with a series of paragraphs showing the absence of such effective law-making and law-enforcing as might have secured to the kingdom a real control of its own resources. The final comparison with the brand-new, ready-made kingdom of Hungary well illustrates how totally different was the problem in a nation where there were no traditional units of public life. We cannot agree with Fisher's description of the origin of the electoral college as it appears in the *Sachsenspiegel*. To call Eike's account the "literary fancy of an obscure Saxon lawyer" is to ascribe too much importance to the personality of any one writer. Indeed this account itself is too "literary" to be quite sound; after all nothing except the holding of the great "ministerial" offices can plausibly account for the prestige which first brought together and then maintained these seven men as the representatives of the vast body of the "vorsten alle."

In the chapters upon Italian affairs we see the Empire more nearly in its imperial character, or, to put it more precisely, as a German power expanding itself over Italy, and using the imperial title to defend its aggressions there. The sketch of imperial legislation in Italy is instructive down to and including the attempts of Barbarossa, but grows confusing when it reaches Frederic II. His work in his own *regno* has but little analogy with even the possibilities of what might have been done in other parts of Italy. As a legislator Frederic was a Sicilian and was wise enough to know it. Doubtless he aimed to destroy the local powers throughout the peninsula, but that was a military and political rather than a legislative object, and it is confusing to represent this man, whose every instinct as a ruler came from his Italian origin and his hereditary kingdom, as an illustration of a policy connected in any organic way with the history of the "Empire."

The chapter on the imperial administration in Italy is not very satisfying. Its point of view is correct, but it does not give us quite enough of a rather abundant material on the attempts of successive rulers to place effective representatives at the head of towns or districts for administrative purposes. Here was the real *crux* of the Italian problem. As Mr. Fisher shows in many places, the Italians were curiously ready to pay moderate taxes and to admit foreigners—Germans as well as others—to executive office; but they demanded the right to define their taxation and to choose the officers themselves.

As regards imperial finances, the result of Chapter VI. is summed up in the phrase "it is needless to add that there was no general imperial taxation"—a very negative result indeed but altogether justified by the facts. This chapter deals wholly with Germany and is concerned therefore with the purely royal German aspect of the Empire. The comparison with England is instructive in more ways than the author seems to have intended.

Mr. Fisher's method of presentation may, perhaps, fairly be called "broad." The book, in spite of its somewhat repellant technical aspect, has a distinct literary flavor. Like most of its predecessors, it approaches the Empire as if its centralizing features were the most significant, and then, as it were, apologizes for finding them so little impressive.

Yet this negative result is valuable as showing once more and by a convincing process that the real history of the Empire is to be found in its parts and in their continuous resistance to the encroachments of a central power which seemed to them an intrusion upon their traditional rights.

The outward appearance of these volumes is beyond praise, but there are some curious blemishes of proof-reading. That Mr. Fisher "knows German" as that phrase is understood in England, we do not doubt, but the pages fairly bristle with inaccuracies of German quotation. On page 165 of Vol. I. we note in a space of three lines five errors which can be due only to ignorance of the language. A truly classical illustration is on page 181 of Vol. I., where a certain nominee to an imperial deputyship appears as "Frederick of Statthaltern!" Latin quotations on the other hand are eminently accurate.

Saladin and the Fall of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. By STANLEY LANE-POOLE, M.A. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1898. Pp. xxiv, 416.)

SINCE the time of Scott, at least, the name of Saladin has been familiar to all lovers of English literature, and it is indeed "singular," as our author remarks in his preface, "that, so far as English literature is concerned, the character and history of Saladin should have been suffered to remain where Scott left them seventy years ago, and that no complete life of the celebrated adversary of Richard Coeur de Lion should have been written in our language." It was a happy thought to include a life of Saladin in the "Heroes of the Nations" series, for his was the life of a great and noble man, and at least some knowledge of his early career, his education and development is necessary, if we wish to understand the events which culminated in the tragedy of the loss of the city, and the fall of the kingdom, of Jerusalem. The division of the Seljuk empire, which followed the death of Melik Shah in 1092, had given the Crusaders a chance to get a foot-hold in Syria. How precarious a foothold they had actually secured we can realize when we remember the fact, pointed out by our author (p. 26), that at the birth of Saladin "the great cities Aleppo, Damascus, Hamah, Emesa, were still in Moslem hands, and were never taken by the Christians, though their reduction must certainly have been possible at more than one crisis." It was inevitable that, as soon as the western parts of the Seljuk empire were re-united in one strong hand, the Christian possessions in Syria should be in great peril. In this book we read how the process of reconquest and reunion, begun early in the twelfth century, and continued by Nureddin, was completed by Saladin. This great leader, with Fatimide Egypt under his sway, completely hemmed in, on the land side, the narrow domains of the Christians, and, when he was ready, attacked them with crushing force.

In an interesting preface our author gives some account of the principal authorities on whom he has relied. He speaks very highly of Marin's *Histoire de Saladin, Sulthan d'Égypte et de Syrie*, which was published in 1758. On page xv. is a list of the principal authorities. It would have been well to include in this list the names of all the books which are referred to in the body of the work. A study of this list, and the titles mentioned in the foot-notes, will show that the author, while not claiming to have exhausted the literature of the subject, has made use of the most important sources.

The book is divided into five parts. Part I.—Introductory—is divided into four chapters, entitled respectively: Saladin's World; The First Crusade, 1098; The Harbinger, 1127; and the Fall of Edessa, 1127–1144. In these chapters is given a rapid and valuable survey of the civilization of the Seljuks and of the organization of their state, with most appreciative notices of Melik Shah, "the noblest of the Seljuk emperors," and of the great vizier, Nizam-el-mulk. The author calls especial attention to the great zeal of the Seljuks for the promotion of learning, and to the fact that their invasion of southwestern Asia created a revival of the Mohammedan faith. A rapid sketch is given of the disruption of the Seljuk empire, the First Crusade, the rise of Zengy and the fall of Edessa.

Part II.—Egypt, 1138–1174—is also divided into four chapters, entitled respectively: Saladin's Youth, 1138–1164; The Conquest of Egypt, 1164–1169; Vezir of Egypt, 1169–1171; Saladin at Cairo, 1171–1173. Our author knows his Cairo well, and his account of the city in the days of Saladin is particularly interesting.

The scope of Part III.—Empire, 1174–1186—is sufficiently indicated by the titles of the four chapters, which are respectively: The Conquest of Syria, 1174–1176; Truces and Treaties, 1176–1181; The Conquest of Mesopotamia, 1181–1183; Damascus, 1183–1186.

Part IV.—The Holy War, 1187–1191—has five chapters, entitled respectively: The Battle of Hittin, 1187; Jerusalem Regained, 1187; The Rally at Tyre, 1187–1188; The Battle of Acre, 1189; The Siege of Acre, 1189–1191. Whatever may be thought of the killing of Reginald of Châtillon, and the knights of the two military orders after the battle of Hittin, there can be only one opinion of the magnanimity of Saladin's treatment of those who were in Jerusalem when it surrendered to him. His conduct was in striking contrast to that of the leaders and men of the First Crusade. In the chapter on the Rally at Tyre the author well points out what a difference it would have made in the subsequent history, if the Moslems had captured Tyre, but in view of the strength of the city's position, and all the other circumstances, it is doubtful if Saladin could have captured it, especially after the reverse of December 29, 1197 (p. 240), before reinforcements could arrive from the West.

Part V.—Richard and Saladin, 1191–1192—brings the story down nearly to the end of Saladin's life, in chapters entitled respectively: The Loss of Acre, 1191; The Coast March, August–September, 1191;

In sight of Jerusalem, September, 1191–July, 1192; The Last Fight at Joppa, 1192. At last Acre was in the hands of the Christians, but the rest of the story of the Third Crusade is not, for them, a glorious one. There were exhibitions of bravery the most heroic; but how about the slaughter of the hostages at Acre, the vacillation of the Crusaders near Jerusalem, and the truce giving to the Christians such paltry returns for all the blood and treasure which Christendom had spent since 1187?

Chapter XXII.—At Rest—gives an account of the last few months of the great sultan's life, tells of the fatal illness which carried him off in 1193, and gives a summary of his character. We cannot wonder that this noble man was loved by his people, and that his great qualities should have been admired by those to whom his religion was, as it were, an invention of the Evil One.

Chapter XXIII.—Saladin in Romance—is extremely interesting, especially the author's remarks on *The Talisman* and Lessing's *Nathan the Wise*.

Pages 403–416 are occupied by an index, which seems carefully made, though one or two minor omissions have been noted. The tables of the Dynasties of Western Asia in the Twelfth Century, The Family of Saladin, Kings of Jerusalem, Princes of Antioch, and Counts of Tripolis, and the Great Lords of Palestine, will be found useful for reference. The illustrations are both interesting and valuable, while the maps and plans are a very welcome addition to the book. The book is attractively gotten up and is written in an attractive style.

Stanley Lane-Poole has rendered valuable service in his different works by presenting various phases of Oriental history and life in such a way as to interest even those to whom such subjects are ordinarily a sealed book. He has put English and American readers under a still further obligation by his excellent life of the great Moslem hero Saladin.

J. R. JEWETT.

The Great Lord Burghley: A Study in Elizabethan Statecraft. By MARTIN A. S. HUME. (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1898. Pp. xv, 511.)

THE history of the reign of Queen Elizabeth is being steadily rewritten. In no field have the researches of modern investigators been more fruitful. The secondary writers who for so long have copied from each other are thoroughly discredited; it is no longer necessary to rely upon their main authorities, the ignorant annalists and memoir-writers of the time; the picturesque details of scandal-mongers are being tested and rejected; and contemporary controversy is no longer regarded as possessing historical authority. This is the result of the arduous work which is being done in the examination, publication and calendaring of documents. The *Calendars of State Papers*, Domestic, Foreign and Spanish, and the *Reports* of the Historical Manuscripts Commission have already thrown much light upon the dark places, and the specialist investigators, like

Mr. Oppenheim and Mr. Julian Corbett, have done their work directly from original and unpublished sources. It is not until the trained and expert editors of documents have completed their labors that the true history of the reign of Elizabeth, based on research rather than gossip, can be written, but in the meanwhile it is a duty to recognize the services of these trained editors, not only when they bring out ponderous volumes for the use of scholars, but also when they make known in more accessible form the first-fruits of their researches. Major Martin Hume is not only a learned editor of the Calendar of Elizabethan State Papers, but he has also shown himself, both in his *Courtships of Queen Elizabeth* published in 1896, and in his more recent *The Great Lord Burghley*, to be a most competent and interesting writer of history. The editor of documents when he takes to writing history shows a familiarity with his material that other secondary writers can never hope to possess; he moves with a certainty that others cannot rival; and his statements can be received with more perfect confidence than those of others not similarly trained.

One of the points which is being most clearly proven by modern research is that the policy of the reign of Elizabeth was most distinctly the policy of the Queen herself. Major Hume showed this clearly in his *Courtships of Queen Elizabeth* and has emphasized it in his recent volume. But although the Queen was never the slavish follower of any of her advisers, she yet relied more implicitly upon William Cecil, Lord Burghley, than on any other statesman. Burghley never filled the place of a Richelieu; he was never permitted to have complete control of all the threads of policy; he was always the servant and never the dictator of his royal mistress's wishes; his plans were sometimes followed and sometimes rejected; and Elizabeth was as completely master as Louis XIV. was a century later in France. But though Burghley was no Richelieu, he was yet the friend and adviser upon whom Elizabeth chiefly relied, and although she listened occasionally to Leicester and others, at times of crisis she generally heeded the counsels of her most trusted minister. The ministerial life of Burghley is not the whole history of the policy of England while he remained in office, but it may be said to represent its positive side. The attitude of "the Philipians" and of Leicester and Essex was more often dictated by opposition to Burghley than by any constructive ideas and the Queen was therefore wont to recur again and again to the system of Burghley whenever the opportunist ideas of his opponents showed their lack of consistency. Burghley often lost heart at the seeming fickleness of Elizabeth; his scheme of policy of playing off the different combinations of Spain, France and Scotland, and of the malcontents in these countries against each other, so as to prevent any powerful concentration of force against England, was often thwarted by the Queen's indulgence in her personal fancies, or her over-confidence in pledging herself to some particular combination; and Burghley more than once despaired of success, though he never forgot his loyal duty to the Queen's commands. The history of Burghley is, therefore, not the complete history of the foreign policy of the reign of Elizabeth, yet an examination of his views and ideas offers the best basis for following out its changes. A knowledge of Burghley's political career gives the key for the right understanding of Elizabeth's policy, and it is from this point of view that Major Martin Hume has composed his last volume. He gives as a subtitle "A Study in Elizabethan Statecraft," which in a few words admirably describes the purport of his book. Elizabeth's statecraft, with its dissimulation and constant doubling and redoubling upon its traces, with its spies and its lies, with its political wooings and encouragement of piracy, in all its strength and in all its weakness, was forced upon her by her position. The peace of England, while other nations were being torn by civil war, and the salvation of England, when the storm finally burst, were the aims of the Elizabethan statecraft. It is easy to condemn on moral grounds the system she pursued, but it is difficult to overestimate the importance of its success. Burghley had as much at heart as his mistress the strengthening and the salvation of England, and he showed himself, next to the Queen, the greatest master of statecraft that England has ever produced.

Major Hume has deliberately written a study of Burghley as a statesman and a diplomatist, rather than a personal biography. Nevertheless he has brought out clearly the part of Burghley's biography which was necessary in order to make clear his career as a statesman and politician. He passes but lightly over his hero's early days, and touches upon his career during the reigns of Edward VI. and Mary only enough to explain his attitude towards religion and politics during the reign of Elizabeth. It is after the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth that his task became difficult. Up to that time the accessible material is scanty and easily handled; after that time the material is so great that the biographer runs the risk of being swamped. This was the fate of the best-known predecessor of Major Hume as a biographer of Burghley. The monumental work of Dr. Nares, who was at one time Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford, is now chiefly remembered from Macaulay's brilliant essay, for which it afforded the pretext and in which Dr. Nares is held up in jocose fashion as a monster of dullness and long-windedness. Dr. Nares's book is by no means as bad reading as Macaulay pretended and contains a vast amount of interesting matter, but its ponderous form and old-fashioned style have prevented it from receiving its fair degree of commendation. Burghley is himself answerable for the length of time that has elapsed before he has found an adequate biographer. His inveterate habit of writing, during the forty years in which he held high office, first as Secretary of State, and then as Lord High Treasurer, together with the fact that the bulk of the immense mass of his writings has been preserved, has resulted in the existence of a greater amount of material than exists for the biography of any English statesman until the time of Gladstone. The mere reading of so much material is a sufficiently arduous task and to extract from it an intelligible résumé of Burghley's tortuous policy might well appear almost impossible. It is only by resolutely keeping his mind fixed upon the knowledge that he was writing an essay on Elizabethan statecraft and not a history of Burghley's policy, that Major Hume has been able to make a readable book, and it should be said in conclusion that his book is eminently readable. Nowhere else can be found so clear an exposition of Elizabeth's foreign policy, and a careful study of it serves to make intelligible and consequent the various volumes of the *Calendars* of the Elizabethan State Papers, Foreign and Domestic, which appear at regular intervals in the magnificent series that the experts of the English Record Office are steadily producing.

H. MORSE STEPHENS.

The Building of the British Empire: The Story of England's Growth from Elizabeth to Victoria. By ALFRED THOMAS STORY. ["The Story of the Nations."] (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1898. Two vols., pp. xvi, 391; viii, 468.)

The Growth of Empire: A Handbook to the History of Greater Britain. By ARTHUR W. JOSE. (Sydney: Angus and Robertson. 1898. Pp. xii, 444.)

THE history of the British Empire, as opposed to the history of England or of Great Britain or of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, has of recent years received much greater attention than formerly. It is beginning to be seen that there was a very essential likeness between the growth of that empire in America, in Asia and in Africa, and that the history of the British colonies and dependencies can best be grasped by considering them as a whole instead of separately. No one would deny the excellence of the work done by such men as Mr. Theal in working out the details of the development of the British power in a particular area, and it is only after such specialist work has been adequately completed that the historian of the British Empire can attempt his larger task. The conception of the Empire, as apart from the mother country, and of its development as the most significant effect of the policy of the mother country, was the theme of Sir John Seeley's *Expansion of England*, but Seeley himself only indicated what had to be done and produced a stimulating rather than a definitive work. It is probably to the influence of Seeley and of the school of imperialist politicians in England that is chiefly due the number of small books on the history of the British Empire that have appeared during the last few years.

One of the worst specimens of this literature is Mr. Story's *Building of the British Empire*, which fills two volumes of the "Story of the Nations" series. It is a particularly unfavorable specimen of the sort of popular literature which is still allowed to pass current as history. The author, though he has attained considerable success in other branches of literature, has not the faintest idea of writing history. In his chapters on India, for instance, he quotes as his main authorities, without ever mentioning volume and page, Mill and Green and *mirabile dictu* even Hume! The history of such a writer cannot, of course, be taken seriously, for he has no sense of the value of authorities and no idea of the way to handle them. Mr. Story says in his preface that he has "had recourse, as far as possible, to the best sources," and since those best sources seem from his citations to be Hume's *History of England*, Robertson's *History of America*, Grahame's *History of the United States*, *A Popular History of America* and Mill's *History of British India*, there is no more to be said. Mr. Story's literary style is no more commendable than his use of authorities, as may be seen by the following passage, taken at random: "There are those who imagine that it is possible to stay; who would arrest the stars in their grand ecliptic roll, and have the solemn march of the ages lag to the tune of their buttery-hatch. They would still keep the good new wine in the old bottles, like the fond old grandmother by the ingle-nook, even at the risk of ruining the whole vintage. Best lay the old tackle aside and go to work like thrifty husbandmen and make fresh bottles, and so preserve the bubbling must to make the evening glad" (Vol. II., p. 453). This is the sort of stuff that abounds in Mr. Story's pages.

Much more adequate, far better written, better proportioned and more carefully arranged than Mr. Story's pretentious work is the little volume by Mr. Jose on *The Growth of the Empire*. Apart from the evidence it gives of careful study of good authorities Mr. Jose's book has the special interest of being written by an Australian and published in the capital city of the oldest Australian colony. This fact gives special interest to the chapter on Australia, but it is fair to state that the Australian scholar does not lose his sense of proportion and pays as careful attention to Canada, South Africa and India, as to his own part of the world. After reading the turgid pages of Mr. Story it is a relief to turn to the simple directness of Mr. Jose, and it is a pleasure for a critic, who hates to condemn, to be able to conclude after words of condemnation of one book with hearty commendation of another.

H. Morse Stephens.

Memoirs of Lady Russell and Lady Herbert, 1623–1723, compiled from original family documents by Lady Stepney. (London: Adam and Charles Black. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1898. Pp. 244.)

No book can be uninteresting or valueless which relates to Lady Russell, whom the poet Rogers calls "that sweet saint who sat by Russell's side," or to Lady Herbert, who accomplished in real life the pretty achievement with which Julia Marlowe is now charming her audiences, namely, the rescue of a husband from prison by exchange of garments. The book before us, with all its obvious limitations, contains many interesting letters and some good points. The drawback to its usefulness lies in the very fact announced in the preliminary note that its narrative was "compiled from original family documents by Lady Stepney, four generations ago." These documents are all modernized as to the spelling; a fact which would alone betray the obvious truth that they were put into their present shape at a time when literary standards were not what they now are, when the most conscientious historians felt perfectly free to modify and rearrange all manuscripts reproduced; and this without deliberate intent to deceive, but simply from want of enlightened historical conscientiousness. We know by the spelling that not a page or even sentence of the letters in this volume appears precisely in its original form; and how much further modification they have undergone there is no means of telling. We certainly cannot summon back Lady Stepney through four generations to question her, and the freedom with which she creates dialogue, while it may give vivacity to the work as historic fiction, not only impairs but almost annihilates its value as history.

Take, for instance, the scene (p. 221) where Lady Herbert is looking for her husband on the battle-field: "Lady Herbert had dismounted, and was picking her cautious and shuddering steps over the obstructed ground. She made up to one of the women [who were robbing the dead] and asked if she could tell where the King's Guards had fought. 'Aye, gossip,' answered she. 'Be'est thou come arifling too? But i' faith thou'rt of the latest. The swashing gallants were as fine as peacocks; but we've stript their bravery, I trow. Yonder stood the King's tent; and yonder about do most of them lie; but thou'lt scarce find a lading for thy cattle now.'" It needs no argument to show that these remarks are a matter of pure invention. Even had Lady Herbert been a modern newspaper reporter, she would scarcely have stopped at such a time to make a memorandum of the precise words of this human vulture; and this single instance is enough to vitiate the historical value of every conversation in the book. It would be easy to multiply such passages.

Who reported, for instance, the talk of the old forester, at whose house Lady Herbert had hoped to find her husband? "'Alas, Lady,' said the old man, 'I think there be some false heart that hath betrayed him; or at least a shrewd mischance must have discovered his retreat to the rebels. For at yester eventide we saw troopers passing between the trees, and soon they fell into the path leading towards the cottage. My son Ned (mine honoured master's godson, so please your Ladyship) ran through the bushes to get before them and give the alarm; but he was too late. They had already seized upon the cottage, and Sir Edward was in their hands. When Ned ventured near, they let fly some bullets at him, and one took the tuft off his cap. As soon as they departed, we ran to the cottage, but found all gone.' 'Did you note which way they took?' said Lady Herbert. 'We were all on the watch, so please your Ladyship, but durst not go near.'"

The two narratives differ so much in their manner of execution that they might almost have proceeded from different hands. The first includes more than 200 pages and is mainly documentary. The second has but 36 pages and offers no documents at all, consisting wholly of very animated narrative. Full justice is done, in this last, to the touching incident of the discovery of Sir Edward Herbert's body by the perseverance of his little grayhound when he was left for dead on the field at Naseby; nor would one wish to lose from literature the letter of Lady Russell to her husband, dated September 25, 1682, when she wrote "I know nothing new since you went; but I know as certainly as I live that I have been for twelve years as passionate a lover as ever woman was, and hope to be so, one twelve years more; happy still and entirely yours, R. Russell" (p. 41). Less than a year after she was sitting by his side at the bar of the Old Bailey, and when she had left him for the last time, the night before his execution, he said to Burnet, "The bitterness of death is passed."

THOMAS WENTWORTH HIGGINSON.

Autobiography and Political Correspondence of Augustus Henry, Third Duke of Grafton. Edited, with an Introductory Memoir, by Sir WILLIAM R. ANSON, Bart, LL.D., Warden of All Souls College, Oxford. (London: John Murray. 1898. Pp. xli, 417.)

THIS autobiography was written in 1804 and 1805, and it deals especially with the period of English history from the Peace of Paris in 1763 to the opening of the French Revolutionary Wars in 1793 and 1795. Augustus Henry, third Duke of Grafton, was born October 9, 1735. He came into public life as a Whig, a supporter of Newcastle and Pitt, upon the eve of the accession of George III. He was prominent and influential in party and public affairs from that time until the coalition ministry of Fox and North in 1783. For several years later he was an interested bystander in politics, in close touch and correspondence with the leading characters of the time. Consequently the story of his mature and official life brings into view one of the most interesting and stormy periods of English history. The volume before us includes the political correspondence of Grafton, covering this period, with Pitt, Conway, Rockingham, Camden, Fox and others. Grafton was not a statesman of the first grade and his name is not a prominent one in English history; but his noble rank, his sense of public duty, his political associations and correspondence, and the high official positions which he held, make this candid story of his own life, with the valuable correspondence which it reveals, a volume of first importance to the student of history.

Sir William R. Anson, Warden of All Souls College, Oxford, the editor of the letters and memoir, writes a valuable introduction which contains "a short account of the duke's career in relation to the history of parties during his time." This introduction outlines the duke's public career, giving a summary of the great parliamentary measures and policies in which he was engaged. Sir William's task naturally leads him to discuss briefly the established principles of the English Constitution in the eighteenth century. This eighteenth-century constitution "did not involve the withdrawal of the King from all control over the policy of the country." The editor points out how the first Hanoverian kings lost this control, and how a minister "who knew the processes of corruption held strings by which he could make the House of Commons dance to any tune he pleased," and how it was that it seemed necessary for Newcastle to "keep a majority" while Pitt used it for schemes of statesmanship. In Grafton's opinion George III. departed from the sound constitutional principles of the Revolution in three respects: "In the exclusion of the Whig families; in the assumption of personal control in the choice and control of his ministers; and in his want of loyalty to those who were his ministers for the time being." Sir William Anson briefly reviews these charges and proceeds to consider Grafton in his relation to parties and ministries under Bute and Grenville and subsequent ministries.

This introduction of the editor gives the best possible brief review of Grafton's career and of the chief public subjects with which his autobiography has to do. Grafton's attitude toward the Rockingham Whigs and their policy, and toward the American policy of Grenville and Townshend; his appointment to office by Pitt, together with Shelburne, Camden and Bristol; their alliance with the Bedford Whigs and its significance; Grafton's own ministry and its conduct toward the Middlesex election and toward American taxation and the East India Company; his four years' service in the office of Lord Privy Seal, from which he resigned in 1774; his career as a member of the opposition under North; Junius's denunciation of Grafton and the latter's relation to Temple, who supplied Junius with material and inspired his invective; Grafton's return to power under Rockingham in 1782;—these events in the career of the duke are all recounted and their significance is indicated in the editorial introduction. At the junction of Fox and North Grafton ends his political career and goes to his country pursuits, which always had for him a strong attraction. "This want of genuine interest in politics," says Sir William Anson, "coupled with his want of clearness in forming and firmness in enforcing his convictions, combine to make him the ineffectual figure which he appears in our history. . . . . In later years he became an ally of Fox, from his deepening sense of the horrors of war and his strong dislike to the repressive measures which were thought to be necessary safeguards against the revolutionary propaganda of France. By a strange revolution of feeling and opinion Grafton, who opened his career as an opponent of the peace of Paris, a devoted supporter of the bold imperialism of the elder Pitt, ends his autobiography with regrets that public feeling cannot be brought around to the anti-national, peace-at-any-price policy of Fox, and that the younger Pitt is still encouraged in his resistance to France and in his efforts on behalf of England and of Europe."

Some personal and private aspects of the duke's life are also noticed. His connection with Nancy Parsons was made historical by one of Junius's bitterest invectives, and Grafton "appears to all time as depicted in the tremendous apostrophe: 'Sullen and severe without religion, profligate without gaiety, you may live like Charles II. without being an amiable companion, and for ought I know may die as his father did without the reputation of a martyr.' "

These salient features of Sir William Anson's Introduction may serve to indicate the historical scope and importance of these memoirs and letters. Throughout the pages of the autobiography itself the reader finds interesting and suggestive passages that throw fresh light upon the politics of the times as from the inner circle. On the Peace of Paris Grafton speaks like a devoted follower of Pitt: "The preliminaries of that Peace might have become popular if the King of Prussia, our faithful and undaunted ally, had not been abandoned in a manner disgraceful to the honor of this country and unmerited by him, who had never swerved one instant in his steadiness to the alliance." The duke deplores "this melancholy proof of the all-powerful influence of the Crown, though it had not then mounted to that height where we now behold it." The editor calls attention to the doubt that naturally arises over the statement that the influence of the Crown was a more potent factor in politics in 1804 than it had been in 1762. He explains that if the King's wishes in 1804 had greater weight it was due to the accident that George III. was always on the verge of insanity in his later years—a suggestion which may serve to illustrate the purpose of the editor's notes throughout. They are notes for which the reader is constantly thankful.

As Secretary of State under the first Rockingham Ministry Grafton supported a conciliatory policy toward America. But he expresses the opinion that the repeal of the Stamp Act could not have been carried unless accompanied by the Declaratory Bill: "so great was still the desire, both within and without doors, of drawing a revenue from America." He speaks of the lack of authority in the ministry, during Pitt's illness, to cause the dismissal of Townshend for his reactionary and Tory measure during an important juncture in American affairs, though Townshend was acting contrary to the known decision of every member of the cabinet. Nothing short of dismissal could have prevented Townshend's measure. But Grafton did not seem to have been very seriously impressed with the necessity of preventing it. "For," he says, "the right of the mother country to impose taxes on the colonies was then so generally admitted that scarcely any one thought of questioning it, though a few years afterwards it was given up as indefensible by everybody."

Grafton was a devoted admirer and follower of Pitt. He characterizes Pitt's views as "great and noble, worthy of a patriot; but they are too visionary to expect that ambitious and interested men would co-operate in promoting them. Pitt's plan was Utopian, and I will venture to add, that he lived too much out of the world to have a right knowledge of mankind." This was said in some suggestive passages on Pitt's desire to organize a ministry above party, his desire that the "men of the best talents and fortunes and highest rank, taken from every party, should unite in one common cause." "Measures not men" was the dictum of Pitt, and he was ready to stand with all who would stand with him by the cause of liberty and the national honor upon "true revolution principles."

Grafton seems to have had a poor appreciation of, and but little sympathy with, Rockingham's more modern view of the position of a prime minister. Rockingham insisted upon having the King's commission to form an independent ministry. Grafton was willing to accommodate himself to the royal wish that the minister should submit suggestions and advice which the King might accept, reject, or modify; and he seemed to be willing that the King might govern through his favorites if only Grafton and the true Whigs were his favorites.

Reverting to the controversy with the colonies, it may be said that the letters of Camden to Grafton will be found of special interest to students of that subject. "The issue is now joined," says Camden, in a notable letter of October 4, 1768, "upon the *right* to tax—the most untoward ground of dispute that could have been started; fatal to Great Britain if she miscarries, unprofitable if she succeeds . . . After both sides are half ruined in the contest, we shall at last establish a right which ought never to be executed."

The Spanish efforts to secure Gibraltar and the negotiations for peace in 1782 receive considerable attention. The last chapters are devoted to the Coalition and to the ministry of the younger Pitt. Grafton reports his intimate conversation with Fox while the latter was contemplating his union with North. "I will tell you plainly and without hesitation," says Grafton, "that I dislike your junction with Lord North and his friends extremely. Yet in the present state of the country I do not see what better can be now substituted: as you have unfortunately put an end to the union of the Whigs with whom, and for whom alone, I could ever wish to be in office."

The letters in the chapter from Conway, Camden, Pitt and Fox on the ministry of the younger Pitt will be found full of interest to the student of the time; and the volume closes with this valuable correspondence. The volume is one which takes the reader to the sources. Like the memoirs of Rockingham and Walpole, the autobiography of Grafton presents the personal testimony of a competent and important participant in the events that are described. Though the author of the autobiography was not a great character in history, he was, as Mr. Lecky says, "not destitute of the qualities of a statesman." His recollections bear the stamp of an honest purpose, while his correspondence is invaluable as records of his times. Such material edited by one of the great masters of English history is beyond the reach of adverse criticism by the historical reviewer, and it is to be presumed that such an original and authenticated account of one of the most engaging periods of English history will be gratefully received by all historical students.

JAMES ALBERT WOODBURN.

The Life of Nelson, the Embodiment of the Sea Power of Great Britain. By A. T. MAHAN, D. C. L., LL. D., Captain in the United States Navy. (Boston: Little, Brown and Co. 1897. Two vols., pp. xiii, 454; xvi, 427.)

CAPTAIN MAHAN's latest book is his best; these two volumes fitly crown the work done in their three predecessors. It is not astonishing that this standard life is already passing into a new edition. It has simply displaced all its predecessors except one, that of Southey, which is the vade-mecum of British patriotism, a stimulant of British loyalty, literature of high quality, but in no sense a serious historical or psychological study. The author of the volumes under review has followed the same scientific method which he used so successfully in the first three of the series, but, conceding what is just and right to them, his results in these are better because his material was better. He has followed Nelson day by day throughout life in a correspondence which was not edited for political and personal considerations as was that of Napoleon; besides he is dealing with a man of his own blood and his own profession; we had almost said of his own time, for unlike Napoleon, Nelson was a man of the nineteenth century. The former was essentially a medieval Latin modified a little by contact with central Europe, and such training as he had was in the conceptions of an earlier century.

The reader will therefore find in this book three things: an unbroken series of verified historical facts related in minute detail; a complete picture of the hero, with every virtue justly estimated but with no palliation of weakness or fault; and lastly a triumphant vindication of a thesis novel and startling to most, that the earth's barriers are continental, its easy and defensible highways those of the trackless ocean. The facts of course were already known, but they were not known in connection with the great tide to which they were contributory, nor as compelled in form and sequence by the tremendous character of a genius never before completely understood or portrayed.

This is in reality the great feature of the book, that Nelson finally stands forth as the man he was. The book is adorned by a series of admirable portraits, and the author has made them live again by his study of Nelson's letters, so that his readers get a familiar acquaintance with the great admiral's appearance at every stage, almost as if listening to an appreciative contemporary. Captain Mahan shows us the boy, youth and man: in gesture, carriage and style—the very part and cut of the hair is carefully described. Nelson's health, his wounds, his seasickness, the interchange of relations between mind and body, all are minutely described. We see in lifelike reality his charms and his virtues offset by his vanity and short-temper; his timidity and leonine boldness contrasted; his passion for glory moderated by his sense of honor and devotion to professional duty; his extreme sensitiveness to criticism combined with his reckless defiance of official restraint in any great crisis; his diplomacy, strategy and tactics, his frailty and criminal folly; all these we have delineated in graceful fluent style against the background of the times sketched in with master-strokes. The author is true in a high sense, because he knows thoroughly the close-knitted web of the events throughout the contemporary world, and apprehends the intricate modification of one series of facts by another at all times in all men. He is indulgent and sympathetic, not in order to confuse his hero with an evolutionary process, but the more completely to separate himself from his subject and carve it in the round; he is as cogent and vigorous in the modeling of Nelson's defects as in exhibiting the perspective of his strength and virtue.

Nor is this book in any sense polemic except in its calm and merciless logic: the conclusions of the writer are not reiterated and thundered but they are forcibly suggested. To the concluding work of a cyclical comprehensive scheme, we might expect a peroration. There is none, but we rise from the perusal of these volumes with the unalterable conviction that Captain Mahan has revealed the modern world to itself. The English-speaking races are notoriously devoid of theory in the conduct of their affairs. In developing their institutions they build stone upon stone, course upon course, and finding their edifice commodious are indifferent to its symmetry. The development of sea-power in Great Britain came through the necessity of self-preservation; it was observed, but not analytically examined. Mahan's high place as a historian is assured not merely by his accuracy, his dispassionate judgment, his insight into character, and his constructive imagination, but above all by the revelation he has made that the course of history is in this age and for long to be determined by the expansion of European civilization into the ends of the earth, and by the determination of international relations not upon land alone, but upon the broad expanse of the ocean, both as highway and battlefield. Trafalgar had little immediate effect upon the course of contemporaneous events in continental Europe, but it settled the fact that there would be a new balance of power for succeeding generations in the settlement and commerce of the greater Europe throughout Asia, Africa and America, and in their connection one with the other as controlled by sea-power.

As far as we know there has been but one attack on Captain Mahan's accuracy and critical judgment. This was in connection with Nelson's conduct at Naples in June, 1799. How the author deals with presumptuous rashness and incompetency can be seen in the second edition of the book. We know of no finer example of historical criticism. Of psychological analysis, the finest specimen in the work is the account of Nelson's relationship with Lady Hamilton. The woman is depicted in all her meretricious tawdriness, the man in all his conspicuous virtue; yet in the nice account of how the hero fell there is a perfect illustration of the proverb that the excesses of conscious virtue are more dangerous than those of vice, since the former are not restrained by conscience. For masterpieces of historical condensation we refer the reader to paragraphs like that on page 63 of Vol. II., which is but one of many scattered throughout the book.

It is not the province of this journal to outline the contents of great books nor to abridge the strength of a great picture into the feeble lines of a miniature; if it were, neither would be possible in this case, for the self-restraint of the author makes it impossible to prune or omit anything written by him. The book is one to be read and pondered exactly as it stands. The over-haste of those who skim and skip cannot put the reviewer under contribution for their knowledge or opinions, even if he were willing so to be taxed.

It appears to us that in the case of this book the reviewer can have but one of those functions ordinarily attributed to him. The student of history must constantly recall the author's point of view; Captain Mahan's is that of a naval expert. We gravely doubt whether he sufficiently recalls the duty imposed by his own skill as a writer. This book will be read by thousands of general readers who will justly consider it final. For such a public we believe he should have explained the moral as well as the legal aspects of certain events: for example in dealing with the battle of Copenhagen, we should have felt more content, could he have been more emphatic in his dealing with Nelson's notorious *ruse de guerre.* We doubt again whether the average student can understand the exact truth when he reads that "Prussia *promptly* adhered to the Armed Neutrality;" she was prompt to be sure, but most reluctant. Nor do we care to find the dubious pages of Bourrienne quoted as authority for Napoleon's conduct. These and some other similar cases of a too concise accuracy in the use of words are not of great importance in themselves nor numerous enough to constitute a blemish, but the reader should remember that Captain Mahan is a man of war who, although a fascinating writer and general historian, is chiefly concerned with history as a department of his profession and does not primarily regard it as a discipline of ethics.

Sir Robert Peel, from his Private Papers. Edited for his Trustees by CHARLES STUART PARKER, sometime M.P. for the County and for the City of Perth, and late Fellow of University College, Oxford. With a Chapter on his Life and Character by his Grandson, the Hon. GEORGE PEEL. Vols. II and III. (London: John Murray, 1889. Pp. [25], 602, [8], 663.)

PEEL held office for twenty years. He served under George III., George IV., William IV. and Queen Victoria, and was three times prime minister. His active political career began in 1810, when he became Under-Secretary for the Colonies in the Tory administration of Perceval, and it was continued until his death in 1850, when although out of office and no longer leader of the Conservative party, he was still a member of the House of Commons. Mr. Parker, the editor of the Peel Papers, early in the second volume records a conversation which he had with Gladstone in respect to Peel. Gladstone, who began his official career under Peel, then affirmed that, as there were two Pitts, one before and the other after the French Revolution, so there were two Peels, one before and the other after the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832. These new volumes begin in 1828, on the eve of the break-up of the old Tory party over Catholic Emancipation, and four years before the first Reform Act was passed. But it is with the Peel of the period after 1832—of the twenty years during which modern England was so largely in making—that they are chiefly concerned; and the letters and memoranda now published strongly emphasize Gladstone's description of Peel, and likewise confirm Guizot's estimate of the Peel of the period after Reform, when he described him as the most liberal of Conservatives, the most conservative of Liberals, and the most capable of both political parties during this epoch of English history.

Taking the three Peel volumes as a whole, it is difficult, if not impossible, to name any other collection of nineteenth-century letters and papers now published, which can be of greater value to students of modern English political history. They have this great value, not only by reason of the epoch-making periods which they cover, but also because the vast amount of material embodied in them is all first-hand. The work of the editor has been practically confined to selection and arrangement, and this work has been exceedingly well done. Mr. Parker's introductions to chapters, based mostly on Peel's *Memoirs*, on the Hansards, and on other equally authoritative material, are usually very brief. So, invariably, are the paragraphs knitting the letters together. There is so little of the editor that the volumes may be described as consisting entirely of the correspondence of Peel and his political colleagues. The two later volumes, which now complete the work, begin in 1828, and cover the period intervening between 1828 and 1850. They thus deal with the closing years of the old Tory party, and with the last years of the parliamentary system which came to an end in 1832, as well as with the great constitutional and economic changes which were made during the next twenty years, and with the readjustments of party lines which went on during the later half of Peel's life, and in which he had so eminent a share.

The three volumes bridge over the old and the new political England. They begin in the first decade after the Union of Ireland with Great Britain, and cover all the movements and changes in English politics, home, colonial and foreign, constitutional and economic, from the Union until the abandonment of protection in 1846.

In the first two volumes there are many letters which show how difficult was the administration of Ireland after the Union had taken place. The Irish Parliament was gone. The Union had removed this great difficulty in governing Ireland, and this great cause of apprehension in England. But the Castle system was continued on much the same lines as before the Union. Protestant ascendancy was undisturbed until 1829. Even then the real disturbance of the old system, so far as the executive details of Irish administration were concerned, was but small. Peel, notwithstanding his former and decided opposition to Emancipation, was loyal to the act which political exigencies compelled him to carry; and his letters, for several years after Emancipation, contain the amplest evidence of his active and persistent dislike of the Castle traditions, and of his anxiety that the political and civil equality between the two forms of religion in Ireland, established by the act of 1829, should be real and of advantage to the Roman Catholics, who for a century and a quarter had labored under the disadvantage of exclusion.

With respect to movements more exclusively English, the letters bring out the inner details of the unsuccessful Tory opposition to Parliamentary Reform, and the extreme apprehensions with which the Tories at this time associated with Peel regarded the measure which Lord John Russell and Earl Grey carried through Parliament. Arbuthnott, who had been a Tory government whip, and who was for so long the close and intimate friend of Wellington, and for years a channel of communication between Peel and Wellington, characterized the Reform Act as "nothing but wickedness and atrocity." This expresses the feeling of the Tories in 1832; and as the letters to Peel for several years subsequent to 1832 bring out, the Tories persisted in the conviction that the constitutional changes made in 1832 must inevitably endanger property and the stability of the Crown. Convictions like these were, of course, expressed in Parliament, when the bills of 1831 and 1832 were being forced through the two Houses by Russell and Grey. How long and how apparently sincerely these convictions were afterwards held by the ultra-Tories is exemplified by many letters to Peel; and letters, too, which were written privately and with no view to popular political effect. As late as 1836, even Sir James Graham, who had been of the Whig party and who joined it again after the repeal of the Corn Laws, wrote to Peel in the interest of a movement to be organized to resist "the tendency to a Republic."

After Parliamentary Reform came the reform of the old municipal corporations; and again, the letters to Peel give the inner history of the Tory opposition to the measure which has been the foundation of modern municipal government in England, and which in the political history of England in the nineteenth century must rank in importance next to the far-reaching change in the representative system in 1832. One after another the great changes which took place between 1832 and the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 are elucidated in Peel's letters and in those which were written to him by his correspondents. The origin of the modern income tax in England; the establishment of the existing currency system; the various measures of relief for Ireland; and finally the abandonment of protection are all dealt with in the letters to and from Peel. Peel, more than any of his Tory colleagues, loyally accepted the change made in 1832, and from the time he became prime minister for a brief period in 1835, owing to the eagerness of William IV. to rid himself of his Whig ministers, it is easy to trace in his letters the development of the Peel whom Guizot described as the "most liberal of Conservatives and the most conservative of Liberals."

Peel's liberalism is shown in his gradual but steady movement towards the principles of free trade; in his attitude towards Roman Catholics and towards English dissenters; in his persistent efforts for an honest and efficient civil service; and in his sincere and enlightened interest in the working classes, and his realization that it was possible to improve their economic and social condition, and also to better the position in which they then stood before the law with respect to their employers. There was much more liberalism of this kind in Peel than there was in the contemporary leaders of the Liberal party, such as Melbourne and Palmerston; and in respect to free trade Peel was much in advance of the politicians who, between the Reform Act and the abandonment of protection, dominated the Whig party in Parliament.

Besides the light these letters to and from Peel throw on the domestic legislation in England in the first twenty years after the Reform Act, and on the new alignment of political parties, they are most informing with respect to the closing years of the old company rule in India, and to British relations with Canada and the United States. Many of the later letters have reference to the Oregon boundary dispute, and to the political troubles in French Canada in the early forties. The Oregon question was pending at the time of the disturbances in French Canada; and in writing to Lord Aberdeen, who was Secretary for the Colonies in Peel's 1841–1846 administration, Peel gave expression to an opinion which, had it been uttered at the present time, would have ranked him among the "Little Englanders." He was disposed to keep Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, for their geographical position made their sea-coast of great advantage to England. But if the people of lower Canada were not cordially with England, "why," Peel asked of Aberdeen, "should we contract the tremendous obligation of having to defend, on a point of honour, their territory against American aggression?" "Let us," he continued, "fight to the last for the point of honour, if the people are with us. In that case we cannot abandon them. But if they are not with us, or if they will not cordially support and sustain those measures which we consider necessary for their good government, and for the maintenance of a safe connection with them, let us have a friendly separation while there is yet time."

When Parliamentary Reform was carried in 1832, an end was made to the system developed to such perfection by George III., under which the Crown exercised an undue and entirely unconstitutional influence upon Parliament. The old relationship between the Crown and Parliament is well brought out in George III.'s letters to North; for these eighteenth-century letters show the King acting as a manager of parliamentary elections, in other words as a "boss," working adroitly and zealously to elect members to the House of Commons whom he could afterwards use. In these Peel volumes, there are many letters from the Queen. More of the Queen's letters to a prime minister are contained in these two volumes than in any volume hitherto published. These letters show the whole-hearted sympathy of the Queen with Peel's free-trade policy. They are also of great value as showing the altered position of the Crown towards Parliament and the Cabinet after Reform, when for the first time for centuries England had a sovereign who was content to occupy a really constitutional position towards Parliament, and to abstain from all interference in the election of its members.

Further than this, the Peel volumes throw much additional and oftentimes new light on Wellington, Canning, Liverpool, Grey, Russell, Melbourne, Palmerston, Graham, Gladstone, Disraeli, Bentinck, Cobden, Bright and O'Connell; in fact on nearly every statesman or politician who was prominent in Parliament between the Union and the end of Peel's last administration. The chapter on the life and character of Peel by his grandson, the Hon. George Peel, with which the third volume is brought to a close, is so helpful to readers, especially to those not familiar with all the ins and outs of English politics during Peel's long career, that it would have been well had it been given an earlier place in the volumes.

EDWARD PORRITT.

Cavour. By the Countess EVELYN MARTINENGO CESARESCO. [Foreign Statesmen Series.] (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1898. Pp. 222.)

THIS book has several claims to consideration. In the first place, it is the first biography written in English of the European statesman who, with Bismarck, dominates the last half of the nineteenth century. The hasty memoir which Mr. Dicey compiled and published a few weeks after Cavour's death, cannot be seriously considered in any discussion of Cavour biographies, and De La Rive's invaluable recollections lost their fine edge in being translated into English; so that to Countess Cesaresco belongs the credit of a pioneer. She is also the first to present, in any language, an epitome of the voluminous material which has accumulated during the past twenty years. But this would not suffice of itself to stamp her book with the distinction which characterizes it. She has achieved the double feat of making the personages she has to deal with live, and of keeping a proper balance between biography and history. It is as rare to find an historian who can breathe life into his characters as it is to find a novelist. In this very series, for example, Mr. Frederic Harrison, writing on William the Silent, and Mr. Richard Lodge, writing on Richelieu, do not always make us feel that William and Richelieu were once alive. Countess Cesaresco, on the other hand, never suggests that Cavour was merely a lay-figure on which she clothes certain historical abstractions. So, too, although in her summary Cavour's work predominates, as it should, the share which other actors took in the unification of Italy is clearly and accurately stated, and the general principles involved are well defined. Her book might be used as a syllabus by any one wishing to master this most fascinating period; but it differs from other syllabi in being full of sparkle and interest.

Among the points which the author has dealt with especially well is the hostility of the Vatican to the reform of clerical abuses in Piedmont. In another chapter Countess Cesaresco brings out for the first time the immense burden which Cavour carried between his compact with Napoleon III. at Plombières, in July, 1858, and the declaration of war, in April, 1859. It has come to be the fashion to speak as if Cavour, having persuaded the Emperor at Plombières, had little more to do until war came; in fact, however, the intervening nine months of suspense tested his immense versatility to the utmost. Throughout this volume, the specialist will value the lucid description of the shifting policy, now hot, now cold, of official England towards the Italian cause. Being an Englishwoman married to an Italian, Countess Cesaresco is able to follow intelligently the international relations of both governments. Elsewhere, in her allusions to French politics she shows an equal familiarity with the country from which even more than from England Cavour got indispensable aid. There are few persons so conversant with Cavour's life that they cannot find some new points, or old ones set in new and striking fashion, in this admirable epitome. It has throughout a wit and charm seldom met with in any historical writing nowadays, qualities which, being accompanied by adequate knowledge, contribute to give the book permanent value. Judging from the present tendency of our producers of historical books it will be long before we have an equally excellent biographical summary of Washington or of Lincoln, though it is greatly to be desired that their lives should be told with just such clearness, condensation, truth and charm.

WILLIAM R. THAYER.

The Annals of the Voyages of the Brothers Nicolo and Antonio Zeno in the North Atlantic about the end of the Fourteenth Century and the claim founded thereon to a Venetian Discovery of America; A Criticism and an Indictment. By FRED. W. LUCAS. (London: Henry Stevens Son and Stiles. 1898. Pp. xiv, 233.)

THIS elaborate work has already been well described and epitomized, and in this brief notice one must proceed directly to the few points selected for attention, simply adding a recognition of the obligation the diligent and courteous author has placed us all under by his valuable labors.

The author claims to have convicted Zeno the Younger of a "contemptible literary fraud," and tells us that, at the time he wrote, "any man with a few ducats in his pocket" could have commanded the material for the narrative. In fact, he maintains that he has furnished "the last word" on this subject. The tone and language of the author are those of the victor, but possibly he is too victorious. His positions are by no means impregnable.

Mr. Lucas objects to apocryphal things in the narrative; yet on this ground Mather's *Magnalia* might be dismissed. The best attested narratives bear marks similar to those of Zeno. In 1607, the colonists in Maine reported nutmegs in the land, with a lake of hot water; yet Mr. Lucas is troubled about a volcano in Greenland, a volcanic country, even though Ruysch, in his map of 1507, shows the site of an island off the east coast of Greenland that was destroyed by combustion. He is disturbed, too, about alleged quotations from Olaus Magnus, even though Barlow, in his description of his voyage in 1584, quotes without credit from Verrazano of 1525. Gosnold in 1602 also quotes, without recognition, the narrative of the Florentine.

The charge that Zeno plagiarized Olaus Magnus, even if true, proves nothing, as critics, upon reflection, must acknowedge; while Mr. Lucas forgets to inquire where Olaus himself received his information, and why Zeno the Elder, having lived before Olaus, could not have obtained information from the same source. One could fill a page with leading, yet unnoticed questions. In the past too much has been claimed for Zeno's narrative, which errs both by excess and deficiency, though nevertheless the narrative is what one might expect under the circumstances. The question is not, how much is true and how much false, but whether there was any voyage at all in 1380.

The question turns largely on the map of Zeno. It is admitted, that "by far the strongest argument ever put forward in favor of Zeno the Younger" is that of Humboldt, who said that the narrative contained "descriptions of objects of which nothing in Europe could have given the author the idea." This statement, however, did not go far enough, and Major wrote, that the geographical information was "very far in advance not only of what was known by geographers in the fourteenth century," but of "the sixteenth century when it was published." This was the ground taken distinctly by the present writer four years previously. Others took the ground that Zeno did not obtain his knowledge of Greenland from sources accessible in his day. Mr. Lucas, however, gives maps including four undated manuscript maps, from which Zeno must have drawn his map. There is no proof that Zeno ever saw these maps. He, indeed, *might* have seen them, yet no possibility of this kind could convict him of forgery. We could with equal reason say, that the maps in question were bad copies of his ancestor's ancient map, for they were bad copies of *some* map. Mr. Lucas was under obligation to suggest an origin for those maps, yet he ignores the all-important question. He first refers to a printed map of Ptolemy, of 1482, with "many of the Zenian names." This map shows a country plastered upon the western coast of Europe ten degrees east of Norway. This appeared in numerous editions prior to 1558, and a glance at the map of Zeno proves that he knew the ignorance of the Ptolemy map and repudiated it. Cartographers cannot entertain for a moment the notion that this bastard map served Zeno in any capacity. It was as bad as the debased map of Mercator, 1554. The Zamoisky and the three Florentine maps of the fifteenth century likewise fail to answer the requirements. Our author assumes that Zeno framed his map from these, but offers little more than assumption. He avoids the issue, failing to attempt any proof of his assumption. A comparison of these maps with the Zeno map indicates that, if Zeno the Younger ever saw them, he repudiated them; for it must be shown that Zeno's map follows them all, whereas it repudiates all. They show not so much as a single mark of priority in respect to Greenland, the crucial point. These four maps are of one and the same type, and show their maker's ignorance of the situation of Greenland, by this error closely approaching still later maps which ignorantly delineate Greenland very much in the form of a cow's tail, attached to the west coast of Europe and switched off a little way into the Atlantic, nearly the entire bulk lying east of Ireland, instead of west. Zeno, on the contrary, places Greenland west of Ireland, where it belongs, putting it in its proper relations to the new western lands, portions of the continent of America, its distance from Europe being at that time well known. By degrees the situation of Greenland was wholly lost to cartography, and Ptolemy and Mercator only show the popular ignorance of the times. The Zamoisky map puts the west coast of Greenland near longitude 10°, and Zeno places it in 64°. It is idle to say that Zeno's idea was taken from either of the maps mentioned, which show the approach of that debasement and ignorance which soon came to prevail. The debasement is emphasized by the fact that the Zamoisky map indicates the settlement of Greenland on the east coast, whereas our author himself admits that it was on the west, and only relatively east. The aforesaid Florentine maps also show the incoming ignorance of the country.

But granting, for the sake of the argument, a resemblance between the Zeno map and the four Italian maps, we must meet the question, where did their author get their conceptions? This opens a most important but unexplored field, and, before Mr. Lucas is credited with the demolition of Zeno, he must take up the investigation; for if in the middle of the fifteenth century these map-makers found Greenland map material, why could not Zeno the Elder have done the same at the more favorable period of 1380? Indeed, it must be evident to all, that the question is still far from final settlement. Evidently there was a very ancient and reliable map or maps of the North, showing Greenland correctly, being the result of generations of voyages, beginning with the first voyage of Eric the Red; and if Zeno's map was not the original, it at least is the oldest and best now known to us. It antedates all others, as its own internal evidence proves.

The Vatican archives and other sources of knowledge which the writer of this notice has personally studied, show that at the time when Zeno made his voyage Italy was in communication with Greenland; and it at least may be inferred that any information or misinformation common to both Zeno and Olaus Magnus must have been derived from similar ancient sources. If however the charge of plagiarizing from Olaus by Zeno were sustained, it would not, in the slightest degree, invalidate the voyage, and on that and on similar points Mr. Lucas has bestowed quite all the labor justified. Zeno probably anticipated Olaus, and while he borrowed much, he knew much from actual observations, realizing that Greenland was a vast country, across the western ocean and associated with a continent. Our conclusion is, that Mr. Lucas, if he intends to hold the ground, must restudy the whole subject, and fairly meet the issues, a few of which, in this too brief article, are now pointed out. For ourselves, from material now at command, we could make a stronger argument against Zeno than our author has, though we fear that in the face of opposing facts, of a solid character, the result would not offer a satisfactory proof of the charge, that Zeno the Younger was guilty of an impudent forgery.

B. F. DE COSTA.

Letters to Washington and Accompanying Papers, published by the Society of The Colonial Dames of America. Edited by STANISLAUS MURRAY HAMILTON. Vol. I., 1752–1756. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1898. Pp. xxi, 395.)

THE Society of The Colonial Dames of America has issued the first volume of the *Letters to Washington*, and proposes to continue the series until the period of the Revolution is reached. It is to be hoped that no such limit will be maintained. Nothing that the society can do will better justify its existence, or prove more grateful to all interested in American history, than to publish the entire series of letters to Washington, now in the Department of State. The field is exceedingly rich, practically untouched, and is essential to a proper understanding of the man and of his time. We would go further, and collect all letters to Washington to be found in other collections, public and private, and so make the publication more complete, more approaching a finality. The society deserves all praise for its patriotic undertaking, and as the book is not to be issued in a limited edition, it is within the reach of all willing to pay the somewhat stiff price.

The manner in which the volume has been edited by Mr. S. M. Hamilton calls for some comment, if only to serve as a note of warning. The limits of an editor's functions are not fixed, but depend much upon personal qualities. Certain features may be laid down as generally demanded. The text must be accurate, and as the writer made it. Doubtful points are to be explained in notes or made clear by insertion of bracketed words. Non-essentials, such as a chance dash or dot, or the use of a dash for a period, may be disregarded, just as a blot, a scrawl or a flourish may be passed over. Capitals and abbreviations are interesting from the study of character they permit; but inserted words may be embodied in the text, and altered words, unless they materially altered the original meaning, may be omitted. A number of such general rules may be framed, and more will suggest themselves to any one familiar with manuscript material. The principal object to be attained is a clear text.

It is with regret, therefore, that it becomes necessary to point out how much below this object the work of Mr. Hamilton proves. He gives the impression of being a careful and most minute editor, even seeking to reproduce in type the little oddities of writing encountered. The task is an impossible one, and the attempt destroys the symmetry of the page. So many of Washington's correspondents were illiterate men, or soldiers more fitted to use the gun than the quill, that the vagaries of stroke are beyond imitation, and really mean nothing. A dozen photographic reproductions would be far more instructive than all the dots, dashes, brackets and signs used by Mr. Hamilton. This frequent resort to symbols is confusing, as the dots are used where no words are omitted, and the brackets occur where no words have been inserted. Unfortunate, too, is the use of the caret and inserted words, for much space is thus wasted and the appearance of the page is seriously marred.

Apart from these mistakes on the mechanical side, we have much to say on the faults of the text, a far more weighty charge to bring against the editor. The curiously close following of pen-points would lead one to expect that at least the words were correctly printed—as written; but this expectation is disappointed so often that serious doubt must apply to the entire text as printed. A few instances are cited, without any attempt to arrange them under different descriptions of error. P. 12, "I have seen a breviate com̄ission" should read "I have sent." P. 15, Col. John Thorton should be Thornton or Thoroton, though proper names are usually carelessly written in the manuscripts. P. 17, Monacatootha could hardly have been "agreed friend" to the English, but was more likely to be "a good or great friend." P. 114, Triplep should be Triplett, and on p. 121, Walkin's Ferry should be Watkin's, an error repeated on pp. 129 and 136. On this last page Talmuth occurs for Falmuth. P. 136 has Deheysen for Deheyser, a name of a dancing master and deserter, one not likely to be unknown. P. 138, the P. A. should be P. H. P. 140, Conigockicg is a remarkable printing of Conigochieg; and Vaumeters on the same page should be Vanmeters. On p. 160 "esputed" should be "expected.' P. 165 has "Car^y on the N first cost," where it should probably read "Cur^y on their." What is the Grass-Guard mentioned on page 142? Conjecture fails to explain the reference to the Ciprian Dame (p. 39) and to XVIII f. f. D. (p. 329). The P. L. on p. 334 must be intended for L^d L., *i. e.*, Lord Loudoun, but the solitary letter between lines 3 and 4 on p. 224 baffles the reader. On p. 358 prenium stands for premium, and the "small panel" mentioned on p. 162 must be a parcel.

These are but samples of the errors due to careless reading of the manuscripts or careless proof-reading. So many of them are unnecessary and misleading that we have dwelt upon this side of the publication in the hope that greater care and a more particular attention to essentials may be given in the volumes to be issued. The contents of the letters speak for themselves, and are full of touches of a personal and historical character. But the full value of these papers cannot be developed unless the editing is improved.

WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD.

The Battles of Trenton and Princeton. By WILLIAM S. STRYKER, Adjutant-General of New Jersey. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1898. Pp. xv, 514.)

DESCENDED from an officer of the Revolutionary Army, born in Trenton, educated at Princeton, an officer in the Union army in the Civil War, adjutant-general of the state of New Jersey, and a diligent student of the history of the country, especially during the Revolutionary period, there is no one so well qualified to write the history of the battles of Trenton and Princeton as the author of this exhaustive work. It must be the storehouse from which future historians must derive their information as to this crisis in the struggle of the nation for life and liberty. To review it must be simply to condense the story.

Part II. of the work presents the materials upon which the author has founded his accurate and interesting history. From Europe and America, from public and private sources he has gathered the rich stores for his work. If any fault is to be found it is in the minuteness of the details, especially in the account of the first battle at Trenton, interfering with the historical perspective and weakening the effect of the salient features of the events described.

The closing months of 1775 were the darkest period of the struggle for independence. The American army had been overwhelmed and driven from New York. Washington slowly and doggedly retreated through the Jerseys, abandoning each place only as the British vanguard entered, until at 11 A. M. on Sunday, Dec. 8, just after the American troops had crossed the Delaware, the British and Hessian troops entered Trenton. Washington had taken the precaution to destroy or to remove to the other side of the river every boat on the Delaware for a distance of seventy miles. This act and Howe's love of ease and consequent delay saved Philadelphia and the cause of freedom.

"These were the times that tried men's souls," but Washington never yielded to despondency. He made every effort to strengthen his forces. The terms of enlistment of many of the troops had expired and they had returned home; some had thrown down their arms believing that the cause was lost; many of the colonists had listened to Howe's proclamation and accepted British protection. Cornwallis had returned to New York and was about to sail for England, to announce that the rebellion was subdued. Washington by his earnest appeal induced his veterans to volunteer for six weeks after the expiration of their term of service on December 31; through Robert Morris he secured ten dollars in "hard money" for each man, and added several thousand troops from Pennsylvania to his exhausted army. He planned and executed the attack upon the Hessians in Trenton. Crossing the Delaware on Christmas night amid floating ice, marching amid wind and snow and hail, at eight o'clock the next morning he surprised and defeated the enemy. Only two of his officers and two soldiers were wounded, and one or two perished in the snow; but two days afterward a thousand of these thinly-clad, shoeless, poorly-fed men were unfit for duty. Col. Rall, the Hessian commander, was mortally wounded: his loss was 22 killed, 84 wounded and 916 captured. General Stryker's account of this battle, as we have said, is the most accurate and complete that has ever been written.

The moral effect of this victory upon the Americans and the British cannot be overestimated. By it the people were inspired with greater courage and patriotism. Washington gave his troops two days' rest in Pennsylvania; then crossing the Delaware for the third time in a week he was again in Trenton.

The victory at Trenton was a terrible surprise to the British at New York. Howe sent Cornwallis with 7000 or 8000 well-disciplined troops toward Trenton. Delayed by muddy roads they did not reach Princeton until January 1, 1777. Washington's troops encountered them at Maidenhead, now Lawrenceville, and delayed them as much as possible so that they did not reach Trenton until nearly sunset. Washington had withdrawn nearly all his troops across the Assanpink and obstinately defended the little bridge in the town. On the last hour of daylight hung the fate of the nation. His officers urged Cornwallis to continue the battle and cross the little creek, but he said his troops were wearied and that he "had the old fox just where he wanted him and would catch him in the morning." But when morning came the game was gone.

Historians generally have not attached sufficient importance to this second battle of Trenton. Washington was now in a most critical position. A superior force was in his front, the Delaware was in his rear; most of his troops had never been under fire and the muddy roads were almost impassable. At a council of war held at night Washington proposed to march by a new and circuitous route around the British army to Princeton, attack the forces there and if possible secure the stores at New Brunswick. The plan was accepted, but could it be executed? A kind Providence again interfered; while the council was in session a cold northwest wind sprang up and in two hours the ground was frozen hard. Shortly after midnight the army marched silently away, while small parties kept throwing up entrenchments and the blazing watch-fires completely deceived the enemy. The army reached the Quaker meeting-house a mile and a half from Princeton about sunrise. Three British regiments, the 17th, the 55th, and the 40th, with three troops of dragoons, had passed the night at Princeton, and the greater portion under Col. Mawhood had just started to join Gen. Leslie at Maidenhead.

None of the historians seems to have noticed Washington's admirable arrangement of his army. The writer of this review was the first to call attention to it. The van and the rear were composed of veterans; the Pennsylvania militia, who had not been under fire save at Trenton, were in the centre. The army was also arranged geographically: the New England troops were in the van, those from Delaware, Maryland and Virginia brought up the rear and Mercer's command, intended for special service, was also composed of veterans. The Philadelphia Troop of 22 men was all the cavalry; the artillery was carefully distributed.

The British 17th and part of the 55th had crossed the bridge over Stony Brook at Worth's (now Bruere's) Mill when, looking back from Millett's hill, they saw the morning sunlight flashing on the arms of the Americans advancing toward Princeton. Mawhood recrossed the bridge and discovered Mercer marching to destroy it. Each was surprised and endeavored to gain the high ground near William Clark's house which stood a little east of the present turnpike and near Mr. Lombard's house. The Americans reached it first and from behind a worm fence poured forth a deadly fire which was returned partly from behind some farm buildings. A bayonet charge drove the Americans down the hill. Mercer's horse was wounded, he dismounted and refusing to surrender was bayoneted and left for dead. The Pennsylvania troops now took part but were driven back, although Mawhood could not silence Moulder's battery. Washington now appeared upon the scene, galloped between the lines and with waving hat and commanding voice cheered them on to fight. Reining in his horse and facing the enemy he sat motionless. Between the lines and exposed to the fire of both armies it seemed impossible for him to escape death. A roar of musketry follows; Hitchcock's Rhode Island Regiment on the right, the 7th Virginia and other Continentals on the left swing into line, the enemy breaks and flies as the shout of victory arises from the American army. Again was Washington saved by the special Providence of God. The head of the column defeated the remainder of the 55th at a little ravine near the town. A part of the 40th escaped; nearly two hundred who were lodged in Nassau Hall, the principal college building, were made prisoners. The walls still bear the evidence of the battle.

Again had Cornwallis been outgeneralled by Washington. He hastened to Princeton only to find that the "old fox" had escaped, but that stores and money-chest were safe in New Brunswick. The British loss was 100 killed and nearly 300 wounded and prisoners. The American army lost about 40 killed and wounded, a large portion being officers. Gen. Mercer and Lieut. Read were mortally wounded; Col. Haslet, Capts. Fleming, Neil and Shippen, Lieut. Yates and Ensign Morris fell upon the field.

These ten days in New Jersey, these battles produced a wonderful effect, gave new courage to the people, strengthened the army, dissipated the British dream of speedy conquest, secured the alliance with France, silenced the enemies of Washington and proved to the world that here was a great military genius, and a statesman also, for Congress had made him dictator of the nation struggling for liberty. "Washington, the dictator," has shown himself both a Fabius and a Camillus. "His march through our lines is allowed to be a prodigy of generalship," wrote Horace Walpole. "All our hopes were blasted by that unhappy affair at Trenton," said Lord George Germain in Parliament.

Well might Frederick the Great say of this campaign, "The achievements of Washington and his little band of compatriots between the 25th of December and the 4th of January, a space of ten days, were the most brilliant of any recorded in the annals of military achievements."

In this work General Stryker has given us an admirable and well-illustrated history of the crisis of the nation's struggle for liberty and independence.

HENRY CLAY CAMERON.

A Constitutional History of the American People, 1776–1850. By FRANCIS NEWTON THORPE. (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1898. Two vols., pp. xxvii, 486; xv, 520.)

IN the preface to these stout octavos Mr. Thorpe tells us that his work "is a record of the evolution of government in this country since the Revolution." Among the struggles through which this evolution has been accomplished he names as of first importance those which sought a wider suffrage, fairer representation, the gifts of freedom and the franchise to the colored man, free schools, "the separation of the state from questionable practices and the establishment of government directly upon the will of the people." This enumeration discloses at the outset the writer's view of his theme; it is, to quote his own words, "a history of the evolution of democracy in America; and by the term democracy is to be understood the form of government, not the doctrine of a political party." The merits—which are great—and the defects—some of which are striking—of the work, are in good part the natural results of this view. A broadly conceived constitutional history of the American people must take into consideration every factor which, acting on and through government, has shaped public policy and built up political character; and such a history must give to each factor the weight which measures with proximate accuracy its influence in determining these results. It is obvious that Mr. Thorpe has not conceived his task in this way. But to identify as he has done, the constitutional history of the American people during the three-quarters of a century immediately following the Declaration of Independence, with the evolution of democracy, is either to slight, or wholly to ignore matters which belong to the very heart of the subject. Upon every people capable of contributing to general progress two distinct tasks are laid: one, to conserve and improve the civilization acquired either by inheritance or through intercourse with other peoples; the other, to diffuse as widely as possible, both at home and abroad, this civilization—a word which stands for all those good things the possession of which separates the most advanced of human kind from those in the lowest stage of savagery. It is in the fulfillment of the second task that a people becomes democratic. In no country, unless we except certain dependencies of Great Britain, has the diffusion of the best things—the things which make life noble and enjoyable, which enlarge the powers and raise the character of man both as an individual and as a member of society—gone further or faster than in the United States. In its political aspect this diffusion takes the form of a right to participate in government and thereby the acquisition and use of the power to shape public policy in the interest of the less advanced, less prosperous and larger division of society. Hence Mr. Thorpe is justified in devoting much space to the movement which has left upon our government and policy an impress so strongly democratic.

But he has erred grievously in so nearly ignoring the counter-movement which not only preserved to us the best things in the civilization brought to the new world by our emigrant forefathers, and the best things in our more recent acquisitions from abroad, but imparted to these certain characteristics that have made them American and at the same time have heightened their value for others as well as ourselves. In the scheme of Mr. Thorpe there is no room for the proper treatment of that phase of this conservative, in some respects aristocratic, reaction called Federalism, that was directed against "the excess of democracy"—an excess which became threatening before the close of the Revolution and culminated in the Shays Rebellion of 1786. But in a properly written constitutional history of the American people what chapter is more interesting, more instructive, or, for the healthful progress of the nation, more vitally important, than this? To this reaction we owe not only the preservation of the Union and the establishment of its national character on a firmer basis, but also escape from the danger at the time imminent, of a break in the continuity of our historical development; for this rested on Anglo-Saxon ideas and institutions; but the democracy of that period in its hatred of England and infatuation for France turned for its ideals first to the teachings of French revolutionary writers, and next to the conduct of French revolutionists.

To Mr. Thorpe's one-sided conception of constitutional history we may trace also the scant attention he bestows on the national constitution and the statesmen who have done most to nationalize the Union. The citadel of American democracy has ever been in the states, and consequently it is in their constitutions and legislation that we can study its development to greatest advantage; but in the minds of its framers, one of the chief functions of the Constitution of 1787 was to protect the interests and rights which democracy was endangering in the states, and this function it has discharged ever since. It is probable that the Constitution of 1787 as it left the hands of the convention was as little democratic, was in fact as anti-democratic as it could be without destroying all hope of acceptance by the people; its chief interest therefore to a historian of democracy grows out of the restraints, in part obviously salutary, which it imposes on that movement. It is true, however, that since the days of Jackson, and largely though by no means wholly through his personal influence and policy, the executive of the national government has become, in a higher degree than the Philadelphia convention thought possible or desirable, the servant and leader of the democracy. This circumstance does not receive from Mr. Thorpe the attention which its importance, as measured by his own conception of constitutional history, would seem to demand.

There are few features of the book so disappointing as the treatment of the statesmen who have done most to nationalize the Union. In the index (which, it must be confessed, is not so full as it should be) there are but four references to Washington; and of these, three express nothing as to the views of the writer, while the fourth says: "Even Washington participated in these doubts (those of Hamilton in regard to the capacity of the people for free government), but when called to the executive station, he sought to give popular institutions a fair trial." (It is fair towards the writer to state that in the portion of his work devoted to the account of state conventions it is often difficult to know whether we are reading his own views or those brought forward in the convention; hence it is possible to do him injustice by imputing opinions which he merely quotes.)

The estimate of Hamilton is as follows: "At the threshold of its existence (that of the national government) was Hamilton, the master-spirit of the doctrine of implied powers, than whom a more intelligent man, or one more honest, pure and patriotic in motive, never lived; but his talents and his patriotism were perverted by federal doctrines, and his views and opinions of free government were erroneous. Had he not doubted the capacity of the people for free government?" Marshall is treated with more consideration, although, in a passage which seems to be a dictum of the writer, it is averred that "Marshall's opinions on the franchise were worthy of being accepted as authority. In purely legal matters not involving constitutional powers, his opinions were always sound, but upon constitutional questions there could be no worse guide. He invariably leaned towards the power of the federal government, and, where there was no express grant of power, he was always ready to imply one upon the slenderest pretence."

Clay, Webster and Jackson fare at the hands of Mr. Thorpe but little if any better than does Washington. Indeed it is scarcely too much to say that a reader wholly dependent on this work would remain in almost total ignorance of the highest services of the statesmen who have contributed most to the excellence of American constitutions.

It is also proper to direct attention to the doctrine of parties hinted at, if not fully disclosed in the book: "The national constitution . . . was intended to be administrative, not theoretical, in character. . . . The omission of definitions has proved the wisdom of its makers and the opportunity of posterity . . . The constitution never laid down hard and fast lines of civil procedure. Yet chiefly because such fundamental provisions were lacking, the conduct of national politics fell inevitably into the hands of political parties, and government became an affair of administration. Parties did not exist in colonial times, and they are yet in the infancy of their power. They afford full opportunity for the genius of individuals, and are the responsible means by which a conscious people adjust themselves to changing conditions."

I believe that a more thorough study of the history and philosophy of party will convince Mr. Thorpe that the conduct of national politics would have fallen into the hands of political parties even if the Constitution had abounded in definitions of the kind which he describes; that parties did exist in colonial times, and that without them the political progress of those times would be inexplicable, and that parties, particularly at present, do not "afford full opportunity for the genius of individuals" unless the individuals chance to excel in the arts of political management.

Hitherto we have looked at features the responsibility for which may be charged to the writer's inadequate conception of the real scope of a constitutional history of the American people. Let us now inquire concerning the method he has employed. This Mr. Thorpe explains as follows:

> "The principal authorities upon which the evidence rests are the laws and constitutions of the country, and the journals, proceedings and debates of constitutional conventions. . . . Government rests on ideas and ideals. These, in so far as unfolded at the organization of the American commonwealths in the eighteenth century, are traced, some to their origin and all to their end, in the earlier chapters of the first volume. An examination of the constituency follows—the people in their local civil organization and also in their racial and social relations. Our dual system of government—state and national—sooner or later compelled issues involving the question of sovereignty. In one form the issue is stated in 1798 and compromised in 1820. The constituency itself is constantly changing and rearranging the political estate. This calls for some account of the franchise—its basis and its growth. The extension of the franchise to free negroes involves the fate of slavery. . . . The spirit of democracy seizes the constituency, and a general demand is heard that the appointive system be abolished and the elective system be substituted. This demand, active after 1820, leads to a reorganization of government in America. The process characterizes political action for the next thirty years, and appears on party records as a series of reforms in the franchise, in representation, in legislative functions, in judicial organization, in public finance, in local government, and in provisions for free schools. . . . The nature of the civil process during all these years is best understood by examining somewhat in detail the work of constituencies in the North, in the South, in the East in the West, and at the Border. This examination is begun in the first volume and is continued in the second. The time is from 1845 to 1850, and the constituencies are Louisiana, Kentucky, Michigan and California."

The method has excellent features. In going to the debates of state constitutional conventions Mr. Thorpe has placed himself in the best possible situation for the study of his professed object, namely, the evolution of American democracy. That he has made extended use of these sources is proven by the fact that four hundred pages, two-fifths of the entire book, are given to the accounts of the conventions held by four states during the years 1845 to 1850. Without a careful comparison of these abridgments with the original reports it is impossible to give a final judgment as to their exact value. But the example is worth much, and the results amply prove the devotion, industry and skill of the writer as an investigator. There are, particularly in the first volume, chapters of great merit which may be read with profit as essays independent of the general theme. Of these perhaps the most noteworthy is the one entitled, "A People without a Country;" in this the writer describes admirably the inhumane not to say inhuman treatment to which, in the days before the Civil War, free people of color were subjected both North and South.

Anson D. Morse.

Second Annual Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission of the American Historical Association, December 30, 1897. (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1898. Pp. 397–679.)

The second Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission comprises a continuation of the correspondence of Phineas Bond, British consul at Philadelphia, through the years 1790–1794, the Florida side of the French intrigues to get possession of Florida and Louisiana, and a very useful check-list of Colonial Assemblies and their Journals to the year 1800. The assemblies (lower houses) included in the list are those of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Lower Canada, Upper Canada, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Tennessee Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, and Pennsylvania are omitted because the proceedings of their legislatures are accessible in printed volumes in chronological order; and data in regard to Prince Edward Island, New Hampshire, Vermont, Delaware, Kentucky, and the Northwest Territory have not yet been collected. No mention is made of the assemblies of the West Indian colonies. If the list is to be completed in a later Report it would be desirable to have these included.

The Bond correspondence, like the earlier installment, is chiefly interesting for the light it throws upon commerce, immigration, and related subjects. Bond reports, for example, that in 1790 almost all the immigration came through the three Delaware River ports, Newcastle, Wilmington, and Philadelphia. In the single season of 1791 the number of Irish immigrants at these ports by the tenth of September amounted to 4500. The passage cost from £3 to 3½ guineas, a surprisingly small sum for that time. In 1750 the fare from Rotterdam, according to Mittelberger, was 60 florins, and again in 1817 Fearon tells us that a steerage passage in the ship he came in cost twelve pounds, and the passengers "had to find themselves in everything but water." The difficulties which were to arise from English impressment of American seamen are foreshadowed in the remark on p. 463: "A vast proportion of the mariners employed in navigating American ships are foreigners—too many of whom I am sorry to say are his majesty's natural born subjects," and also in the description, p. 525, of the prevalence of desertion, culminating in the assertion that "our ships are often deserted by the whole crew, in the ports of the United States, merely on the score of the superior rates of wages." Bond is also concerned at the heavy investment of English capital in United States funds in 1793. Had it not been for this English demand for American stock "it would never have reached its present price." The prevalence of land-speculation calls forth warnings to confiding fellow-countrymen. Of the more detailed descriptions those of the yellow fever in Philadelphia and of the Whiskey Insurrection may be mentioned.

The Mangourit correspondence relating to the French designs on Florida, while not so full of dramatic interest as the letters on the Louisiana plot in the last Report, present a very vivid picture of an ambitious enterprise of which our general histories give merely a ghostlike glimpse. Mangourit, the French consul at Charleston, who was working up the expedition, was a revolutionary enthusiast whose public and private letters vibrate with political passion. The hapless refugees from San Domingo are "La corruption aristocratique que Saint Domingue a vomi dans cette contrée;" Washington's nonpartisan administration "est un monstre composé de tous les elemens politiques de la nation qui est une Macédoine de l'Espece humaine." Some of the English faction in Charleston indulging in a dinner on St. George's day, they are styled "esclaves anglais" and their festival an "orgie Georgienne." Now and then this intensity is mitigated by a vein of somewhat scholastic wit, as when the proposed capture of St. Augustine is referred to as an "operation pour avoir une bonne traduction française de la cité de Dieu par les divers Augustiens." An interesting and very early use of the term "lobby" deserves notice. Writing August 6, 1793, Mangourit expresses the hope that the "Américains eclairés" in Charleston who were joining the "Société patriotique," "ameneront la tranquilité et qu'ils deconcerterent le luby."

The Florida enterprise, to the cruel disappointment of Mangourit, shared in the general wreck of Genet's mission.

One of the most interesting revelations of these papers (p. 667) is the fact that Talleyrand's instructions to Citizen Guillemardet in 1798 (H. Adams, I. 357), outlining the argument to be presented to Spain for the retrocession of Louisiana, merely reproduces the instructions given in March, 1796, to General Perignon by the Directory fifteen months before Talleyrand came into office.

This second Report of the Manuscripts Commission is edited with the same scholarly fidelity as the first, and for this service we are indebted to the chairman, Professor Jameson, and, for the Mangourit papers, to Professor Turner.

EDWARD G. BOURNE.

The Writings of James Monroe. Edited by STANISLAUS MURRAY HAMILTON. Vol. II., 1794–1796. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1899. Pp. xviii, 494.)

MR. HAMILTON's second volume has a unity which could not be imparted to the first, and which can hardly be impressed upon any later volume. It begins with the beginning of Monroe's first mission to France, and ends with its close. Nearly all the matter of the volume relates to the young envoy's negotiations in Paris, and ample opportunity is given for judging his conduct in them. It was a hazardous experiment on Washington's part to send out for the management of so difficult an office a provincial Virginian of thirty-six, who was wholly inexperienced in diplomacy, however well versed he had become in the domestic portions of American politics. Moreover, to keep the peace with France and also with Great Britain, had already become almost an impossibility. If Jay was well adapted to secure the one and Monroe well adapted for the other, seldom have we had envoys at Paris and London less adapted for mutual co-operation and that concert without which neither could really expect success.

At the beginning of his mission Monroe writes Jefferson that Jay, though he can easily succeed, "will arrogate to himself much merit for address in negotiation;" at the end of it he writes Madison that he sees how desirous Jay was "of embarking my reputation here in support of his, and with a view of sacrificing it, in case his merited to be sacrificed," and dwells upon the old grievance of the negotiations with Gardoqui, which had permanently prejudiced the Virginian's mind against Jay.

Add to all this the extraordinary difficulties and delays and uncertainties of communication with the Department of State at Philadelphia (heightened of late by the activity of belligerent cruisers), the constitutional inability of Secretary Randolph to make a straightforward statement in plain language, his retirement and his supersession by Pickering, who had the opposite vice of expression—and failure of one or both of the envoys may well seem to have been certain. Monroe did not wholly fail. Taking into account all the difficulties, he achieved a fair amount of success in the detailed work of his mission. But its general tone was unquestionably too Gallic, and his promise to the Committee of Public Safety that he would show them Jay's treaty when he received it was highly imprudent. Neither do his frequent remarks on French politics and the state of Europe mark him as a man of much insight and sagacity. He praises the Constitution of the Year III., and includes Barras among those "distinguished for their talents and integrity." His style, though still dull, has gained somewhat in flexibility. Contact with the world has rubbed away some of his eccentricities. His annoying use of "and which" for "which" continues, but he has dropped the writing of "hath" for "has."

There is not a great deal of new material in the volume. Of eighty-five letters of Monroe which it contains, fifty-eight had already been printed in the *American State Papers* or in Monroe's *View*, and two-thirds of another in a foot-note of Sparks's *Washington*, where it is given its correct date of January 3, 1796 (Mr. Hamilton, p. 164, has it a year out of place, January 3, 1795). The remaining twenty-six are derived from the Madison, Monroe, Jefferson and Washington papers in the Library of the Department of State. Mr. Hamilton gives no hint of the provenance of any of the letters, old or new, with a few exceptions. Of the new, all but five are letters to Jefferson and Madison, and many of these supply an interesting private commentary on the public transactions. One of the most interesting passages in these letters is that in which (pp. 440–442) Monroe details one of the inconveniences to which he was subjected by his generosity toward Thomas Paine. After securing Paine's release from prison he kept him at his house, sick and impecunious, for many months. Pichon assured Ticknor that Monroe was far too much under Paine's influence; Mr. Conway thinks that Paine was a masculine Egeria to him, and gave him in good advice a full equivalent for all the money he got from him. However this may be, one's sympathy goes out to Monroe, for Paine cannot have been altogether successful as a household pet. John Wilkes or Charles Bradlaugh may have done great things for civil liberty, but may also have been "gey ill to live wi'." Those of us who still think, after all Mr. Conway has written, that Paine was essentially a low fellow, will be interested in the letter mentioned. Monroe expressed to Paine the wish that, while in his house, he would not write anything for publication on American affairs, lest it react on him. Paine not only disputed the principle, but, to Monroe's extreme annoyance, made private efforts to evade the restriction suggested by his benefactor.

Many interesting documents, not written by Monroe, are given by Mr. Hamilton in his foot-notes. His own notes are sparing and judicious, and his texts lay us all under obligations. There are, however, many instances of careless proof-reading, such as the interchange of "posts" and "ports" (important when the question of the western posts is so prominent), "Vendu" for "Vendee," etc. The third volume, if it will really let us into the arcana of Jeffersonian politics in Virginia from 1796 to 1801, will be eagerly awaited.

Forty Years a Fur Trader on the Upper Missouri. The Personal Narrative of Charles Larpenteur, 1833–1872. Edited with many critical notes by Elliott Coues. (New York: Francis P. Harper. 1898. Two vols., pp. xxvii, viii, 473.)

This book is original matter through and through. From fragments set down now and then and memories of fur-trade as early as 1833, it was written out by its author in 1872. The manuscript was unknown to the editor, Dr. Coues, till 1897.

The work embodies the experiences of forty years on the dual Missouri-Mississippi river and its affluents upward from St. Louis. The author, Larpenteur, born 1807 in France, reached the great river the year that he came of age, and in 1833, being short and slender, with some difficulty obtained employment in the Rocky Mountain Fur Company as a common hand. He was at once packed off with some forty others, each in charge of three mules, to the mouth of the Yellowstone. Their route was first to the upper waters of that stream and very circuitous, being by way of the head of Green river which flows into the Gulf of California. No wonder the caravan was five months on the march. Ft. Union, the point thus reached, was the head-centre from which Larpenteur's activities in the service of various rival organizations, or as a free trapper and trader, radiated for nearly four decades. The first steamer that ever ascended so far had arrived only the year before his coming, or in 1832. His own long voyages up and down were frequent in canoe, Mackinaw boat and steamboat. He once came up on horseback, a six weeks' ride from St. Louis. He became a squaw man, that is, took an Indian wife. Learning something of Indian dialects, he was of use as an interpreter, and had influence in Indian councils. During his first campaign he had been chosen to displace an incompetent clerk.

His narrative, as we judge, is on the whole the most entertaining and yet pathetic portrayal of the American fur-trade during the second third of our century. Its true inwardness is turned inside out by a chronicler whose eyes were never opened to see much difference between good and evil, and who so saw nothing to conceal.

The fur-trade in beginning, middle, and end meant whiskey. Common hands were engaged at sixteen dollars a month but were charged five dollars a pint for whiskey, so that companies had very little to pay as wages. Whiskey was sold to Indians at still dearer rates. Larpenteur once for five gallons bought twenty horse-loads of fur, some of which brought five dollars a pound. He mentions about a hundred forts. What were they? Each was an acre walled in by a perpendicular Indian-proof fence fifteen feet high, to safeguard horses, their owners, and whiskey. Into one corner of this trap Indians were persuaded to enter "like rats that ravin down their proper bane," mostly by night, and to part with furs for infuriating drafts. They were then turned outside the gates, and nobody cared how soon these furibund vagabonds starved, or froze, or scalped one another not knowing what they did.

Arms, powder, and blankets in aid of hunting, and a few trinkets, as beads, bells, and hand looking-glasses were thrown in by traders as baits for catching further plunder. It is too plain that saloons and those not of the best stripe are the names best befitting fur-forts.

All introduction of whiskey was indeed prohibited by United States laws, and all boats bound up the river were thoroughly searched (p. 57). Those laws proved to be cobwebs which big flies broke through and little ones crept through. Liquor was smuggled in, either clandestinely or by bribing officials, or it was sworn in as a medical necessity. A distillery was even secretly started at the Ft. Union fur-centre, corn being obtained from squaws in neighboring tribes. Standing a thousand miles deep in a *terra incognita* this fatal fountain flowed for some time unchecked and undetected.

In the long run selling whiskey was a losing business. It killed or unmanned hunters. It roused cheated victims to bloody revenge. Firewater burned the fingers of those who were bringing it up. Thus Larpenteur says: "The steamer *Chippewa* was set on fire by one of the hands who had gone down into the hold to steal liquor. Some of it having run upon his clothes while he was drawing it, the candle came in contact with the wet parts and ignited them. He was badly burned, and then the boat took fire. Immediately upon the alarm being given the boat was landed, and she was abandoned. Nothing could be saved for fear of the explosion which soon followed—of twenty-five kegs of powder in the magazine," p. 325. The spot became known as Disaster Point. In many ways whiskey was in evidence as twice cursed—cursing those who gave as well as those who took. It was when sailors had succeeded in safely stealing and in drinking whiskey that the sequels were most disastrous. Fatal fights followed with one another and with natives they encountered. Internecine feuds were generated, ended only by murder. Vessels were snagged and sunk by drunken crews, and fur-trading became more and more a lottery with an ever-increasing percentage of blanks. Few drew more blanks than Larpenteur, and there was no greater cheat. His forte lay in trading whiskey for furs. His success in this overreaching was phenomenal. Hence after he had become an outcast from many other positions, he never ceased to be in demand as a fur and whiskey intermediary. Within that circle none might walk but he. At the same point where he began to sell ardent spirits for his company in 1833, there, when cast out of all service, he still sold them successfully till stopped by a special act of Congress in 1871, which banished him from the reservation. Larpenteur, if we believe his journal, was affected by his environment as a Spartan wished his sons to be by the helots whom he forced into intoxication, for he declares himself always sober, p. 161. How then could he love daily contact with a thing he loathed! His whole career shows him to have been a bundle of paradoxes.

James D. Butler.

Horace Mann and the Common School Revival in the United States. By B. A. Hinsdale, Ph.D, LL.D., Professor of Pedagogy in the University of Michigan. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1898. Pp. vii, 326.)

Mr. Hinsdale has paid his readers the compliment of allowing them to interpret Horace Mann for themselves, by using Mr. Mann's own language to convey the 'motive power' of his ideas. The purpose declared in the preface to the book is well carried out; namely: "To set before the reader Horace Mann as an educator in his historical position and relation." It is this historical position which Mr. Hinsdale has most clearly and forcibly stated. The outline of Mr. Mann's character is drawn with a clearness and dignity which makes the book in many ways a model for students. The steps of advance which Mann made in the educational progress of the country are presented with equal order and force. Mr. Mann was a Puritan, bound in his youth with the rigidity of denominationalism. Throughout his life he strove to translate both himself and his whole environment into that more fluent and democratic society for which he gave his life. His two leading mental qualities are his genius in discovering and stating exactly the weak points in the schools as he found them; and second, his quickness and daring in indicating practical lines for immediate improvement. Mr. Mann's own words are the best statement of the mental muddle existing under the old formalities. "With the infinite universe all around us ready to be daguerreotyped upon our souls, we were never placed at the right focus to receive its glorious images. With all our senses and our faculties growing and receptive, how little were we taught; or rather, how much obstruction was placed between us and nature's teaching."

Mr. Mann's continual plea was for better teachers. "The two great needs of the American teacher are emancipation from the text-book and more oral instruction." By oral instruction the individuality of the child is reached. In everything he looked for the free and independent development of the individual, always recognizing the social quality which lies in the nature of this development. He fought for emancipation from the bondage of denominationalism and the release of the child from direct religious instruction in the school; from the limitations which the mere conning of text-books always imposes upon ideas; and for the breaking down of all the barriers which perpetuated the isolation of the child and the school.

To this end he brought about by means of legislation the substitution of union schools for district schools; and this is the real foundation of the common-school system in its present form. In the same manner he brought about the formation of the normal schools; and against great opposition and almost persecution he convinced the tax-payers of Massachusetts that public education must be regarded as a good investment for the public funds. His struggle for the enlargement of the courses of study was equally earnest and productive of results. He reduced the large number of text-books in the schools; he declared that manual training must become a part of the curriculum, "not so much for the sake of fitting for trades as for the mental discipline to be derived from it." His continual insistence was for giving a more practical direction to all the studies upon which children spend their time. He also declared for the equal chance of men and women in all educational work; his influence is felt through all the new Western institutions where they were just beginning in 1850 to try this new phase of democracy. It is interesting also to note Mr. Mann's attention (based upon his insistence on the needs of the body) to the new science of phrenology, which was the forerunner of the new psychology.

In general the great advance which Horace Mann brought about in the consciousness of the public lay in his stating that the relation of man to God which had kept the souls of the Puritans on the rack must be worked out through the practical relations of men to each other, and that in and through education these relations must be brought to consciousness. He felt the ethical and human force of democracy in relation to education.

Professor Hinsdale has given us an admirable statement of the external historical features of the common-school movement—the attempt to realize this ideal of Horace Mann's. He has shown both the historical conditions out of which Mann's work arose, the contemporary changes which accompanied it, and, in the final chapter, some statement of the more important steps that have been taken since Mann's death. The tremendous growth in the extent and complexity of the machinery of the public school system; the increase in public taxation for the maintenance of the schools; the pouring out of private fortunes for educational endowment; the growth of the normal-school idea; the modifications in the course of study as well as in methods of instruction along lines clearly indicated by Mann—these points are well sketched. What we miss, however, is an evaluation, upon Professor Hinsdale's part, of the intrinsic significance of the underlying point of view, and the attempt to measure the import of external changes by reference to their intrinsic ideal. This, however, perhaps lay outside the scope of Mr. Hinsdale's book; and our failure to receive it should not make us less grateful for what he has so successfully accomplished. He has given the ethical intensity of Mann's own personality even if his appreciation of the ethic of the movement Mann represented is somewhat reserved.

JOHN DEWEY.

Life and Public Services of Edwin M. Stanton. By GEORGE C. GORHAM. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. Two vols., pp. xv, 456; xiv, 502.)

UNTIL recently Stanton was the only one of the great members of Lincoln's cabinet whose career had never been fully described. The two principal reasons for this were, that he neither sought nor obtained wide popularity, and that his public life was almost entirely confined to the War Department. For about ten weeks he was Buchanan's Attorney-General; and it was not until the shadow of death was upon him that he became a Justice of the Supreme Court. To write an important and interesting biography of such a man required a great amount of study and investigation, much enthusiasm, and considerable skill in the use of facts. Mr. Gorham possesses all these qualities, and has produced a work of extraordinary value; it is a zealous and successful defence and eulogy of our greatest Secretary of War.

Now for the first time we know the particulars of Stanton's life before 1860. The boy who was left so poor by his father's death that at the age of thirteen he had to become a clerk, did not receive a very encouraging start in life. Fortunately the petty clerkship was in a bookstore. From there he went to Kenyon College, where he continued his studies for more than two years, before lack of further means compelled him to return to earning a salary. For a time he expected to be able to complete his college education; but when he found this impossible he began to read law, and at the age of twenty-two he was admitted to the bar. From near the beginning of his professional career Stanton displayed the elements of greatness. He worked eagerly and unremittingly, says his biographer, "not as an irksome necessity, but with a stimulating resolve to win." He soon outgrew the small practice that was obtainable in such a place as Steubenville, Ohio; so, in 1847, he went to Pittsburg to live. Within the next few years he won some very important cases in the Supreme Court of the United States, and had been retained in so many cases that he moved to Washington, near the end of 1856. It was only a short time before his abilities were recognized by Buchanan's administration and he was appointed as special counsel for the Federal government in some land cases that involved many millions of dollars. After we know of his prodigious industry and skill in detecting and defeating the Limantour land frauds we begin to appreciate the mental and physical energy of Edwin M. Stanton.

Stanton can be understood politically only when we bear in mind that he was almost entirely devoid of the instincts of the politician and of the reformer. He was a Jacksonian Unionist, and resented the reflection implied by Southern aspirations for secession and expansion. If he had ever been a genuine Free-Soiler he never could have stood by Buchanan in the infamous efforts to force slavery upon Kansas. Stanton was primarily a lawyer—a lawyer who would not defend the side that he knew to be wrong, but he was very likely to be influenced by his associations and prejudices after he once became interested in his case. Our author has a strange aversion to the politics of the period from 1840 to 1860; he can spare but nine pages for it. Yet it was the time when Stanton's political tendencies and traits should have manifested themselves. A man's failures and inconsistencies are often as important as his successes and logical persistence. Undoubtedly the truth is, that Stanton was bent on winning his law cases and did not care much more for freedom than Douglas or Buchanan did.

When Cass resigned from Buchanan's cabinet in December, 1860, and Jeremiah S. Black became Secretary of State, Stanton was chosen as Attorney-General, because he was a great lawyer. If any one man may be said to have prevented the peaceful establishment of the Confederacy, that man was Stanton; this service would not have been performed if he had been a politician. Both the biographer and the subject appear at their best in the 110 pages that treat of the period between December 20, 1860, and March 4, 1861. There Stanton stands a lion in the path of the scheming, subtle, threatening secessionists and of the timid, weak Buchanan and of the pettifogging, inconsistent Black. After Stanton had called treason, theft and cowardice by their right names, Buchanan had to stop denouncing Unionists and decide whether, after all, secessionists were the only patriots and altogether right. Mr. Gorham's criticisms of the President and of Black are very effective, but not too severe. The perspective of treason and cowardice is well made.

For Lincoln to put at the head of the War Department, after Cameron's miserable failure, a man whom he hardly knew, except as a Democrat and a severe critic of his administration, was certainly very strange. "He was appointed," says Mr. Gorham, "because, in addition to his great ability, his restless energy, and his absolute honesty, he was an un-conditional Unionist of the Democratic faith, and his appointment would be a proof to the country that Mr. Lincoln regarded the war as the people's war and not that of a party. His personal relations with General McClellan were known to be good, and it was hoped that his administration of the War Department would set in motion the army, the inactivity of which the general in command had attributed to a want of support from the Executive" (I. 240).

In June, 1861, Stanton had said that the corruption that surrounded the War Department seemed "to poison with venomous breath the very atmosphere," and that the army appointments were bestowed upon men whose only claim was their Republicanism,—"broken-down politicians without ability, experience or other merit." Mr. Gorham gives us the particulars as to how Stanton reorganized the department and corrected abuses in many directions. Stanton had taken charge for the sole purpose of making it possible for the Federals to conquer the Confederates, and he seemed to have no other thought until the end. That is why he was impatient, terribly industrious, and often severe and rude. Those who fought with vigor and moderate discretion had his support and were pushed forward. Those who dallied or disobeyed orders thought him a relentless enemy.

McClellan belonged to the latter class, as is generally known. Although the author notices the differences with other officers, a sort of test-case is made of the complaints preferred by McClellan. The way in which this ever-complaining general is followed step by step, refuted out of his own mouth, criticized, ridiculed and cut with the sword of sarcasm comes so near to cruelty that the reader often begins to pity a general who had not capacity or courage enough either to fight like a Napoleon or to plot treason like an Arnold. Many others have reviewed McClellan's movements with severe criticism. Mr. Gorham has covered the man with contempt. Here are a few sentences taken from different places: "Throughout his military career, he always appeared to act upon the idea that those who desired him to fight were plotting his downfall" (I. 332). "He feared the enemy was so weak that he would abandon Richmond and go south without a fight, and yet so strong that he would crush the Union army. And so he stood still and did nothing" (I. 411). "It seems to have become the settled policy of General McClellan to act on the defensive towards the rebels, and to make offensive war only upon his own government" (I. 414). After relating how McClellan failed to obey Lincoln's positive order to pursue Lee after the battle of Antietam, and kept calling for supplies, especially cavalry horses, Mr. Gorham remarks: "In fact, he wanted almost everything. Obedience by him to the President's order seemed out of the question as long as there was stationery on which to make requisitions for what he already had" (II. 68). That this is not trifling sarcasm is made plain by Lincoln's telegram to McClellan: "I have read your despatch about sore tongue and fatigued horses. Will you pardon me for asking what the horses of your army have done since the battle of Antietam that fatigues anything?"

Sherman's quarrel with Stanton about the terms that he entered into with Johnston is treated with much more moderation, as it deserves to be; but the vindication of the Secretary of War is no less complete.

About one-half of the second volume is devoted to the period of Reconstruction. Here the author has given too much space to general questions and to quoting from reconstruction documents where concise and careful summaries are the most that are needed. When Stanton takes up the long and bitter struggle with Johnson the story increases in interest and value, and much new material and original comment are contributed. The author seems to us to attribute too many of the acts of Johnson and of the ex-Confederate leaders to conspiracy and not enough to a perfectly natural prejudice against the negro and Federal interference. Likewise there were more prejudice and anger on the part of Stanton and the men who shaped Congressional reconstruction and tried to get Johnson out of the White House than is admitted.

As a defence of Stanton the work is a great success, but there seems to be room to doubt if it will make Stanton popular. The reasons for this are that the narrative is too long for the length of Stanton's career, and that there has been no attempt to make a careful and frank analysis of Stanton's character and traits in their weakness as well as in their strength. If the author would condense these octavo volumes into one and would give more space to a consideration of Stanton's peculiarities, he would spread the fame of his hero and win the popularity that he himself has already earned by his serious undertaking. Stanton deserves to be very prominent among a score of the greatest of our national heroes.

FREDERIC BANCROFT.

War Memories of an Army Chaplain. By H. CLAY TRUMBULL, formerly Chaplain of the Tenth Regiment of Connecticut Volunteers. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1898. Pp. x, 421.)

THIS is an interesting and valuable work, not primarily historical in aim yet casting upon the history of the Civil War a good deal of important light. The author's experiences covered nearly the entire period of the war, and were extremely varied and characteristic. His service lay in Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia and Florida. He was in many battles, among them some of the bloodiest, in several Confederate prisons, for a time in solitary confinement out of suspicion that he was a spy. This personal record is as entertaining as can be; parts of it are thrilling. Much space is devoted to revelations of soldiers' character and morals, the author thinking with Archbishop Ireland, who during the war was chaplain to the Fifth Minnesota regiment, that "a chaplain can write much better than any one else about the inner spirit of armies." We do not consider this true. A chaplain cannot become familiar with the soldier's worst character or doings. He only sees the best phases. The best phases are, however, instructive, and no other writer, save Rev.

J. William Jones, for the Confederates, has portrayed them quite so well as Mr. Trumbull does. But if the soldiers of the Union army were as a class perhaps less deeply concerned with religious ministrations than our author seems to suppose, they certainly do not deserve the dreadful condemnation which he has pronounced on them on p. 177. "General Washington said truly that while there were soldiers who were controlled by a desire for glory or by a high sense of patriotism, so that they could be depended on for going into action as a matter of duty or of honor regardless of selfish considerations, *the great majority of men* were held to their places as soldiers by their knowledge that the danger of running from the front was greater than that of moving forward in battle line. *This was as true of the soldiers of the Union army in our Civil War* as of Continental troops in the War of the Revolution" (italics ours). Such a judgment about the "majority" of soldiers is an insufferable exaggeration. If Washington really wrote as alleged, the traditional view that he found mendacity impossible is disproved. If "the great majority" of soldiers do not in battles think any too much of glory or of patriotism pure and simple, it is slanderous to allege that they are kept in line by bare fear of running away. Mr. Trumbull was, of course, simply nodding when he wrote this passage, for nearly every page of his book refutes it.

Two or three points of more technically "historical" importance are set forth in these *Memories*. One of them is brought out in Chapter VIII., on "Deserters and Desertions," where it is made clear how the high bounties paid for substitutes as the war advanced conduced to desertions. Men entered the service for money, deserted, and then enlisted again for more money, and so on. "In single regiments one-fourth, and again one-half, and yet again a larger proportion, of all the men assigned under a new call of the President for 500,000 more volunteers, deserted within a few weeks of their being started to the front." Soldiers remember that after having long and vainly applied the death penalty as a means of checking desertions, our government, late in the war, changed policy, offering immunity and honorable discharge to all deserters then actually in service who should confess their crimes and agree faithfully to serve out their terms. The result was good, proving that many deserters were brave men who had simply been swept off their feet by the spirit of greed so rife among civilians at home. Mr. Trumbull appears to have been the author of this change in the method of dealing with deserters. When severity multiplied rather than lessened the number deserting, he reasoned that the new deserters were probably old deserters led by the executions to fear that their turn would come next. This surmise—undoubtedly correct—Chaplain Trumbull communicated to Lt. Col. Goodyear, from whom, through Gen. Ord, it was reported to Washington, resulting in President Lincoln's proclamation of March 11, 1865, in the tenor indicated above.

Trumbull's *Memories* help to a dispassionate view of the treatment accorded Federal prisoners in Confederate prisons; and such a view will differ considerably from that formed by most Northern people during and immediately after the war. Most of the principal prisons were certainly horrible places, cramped, dirty, unsanitary; the diet was bad and meagre; many of the keepers were cruel. That all the sufferings of Union soldiers in these pens were due to the Confederacy's poverty alone can never be shown. For all this, as the *Memories*, Chapter XI., reveal, Southern citizens and Confederate officers and men not only showed kindness to Federal prisoners, but often went out of their way to do this. The worst inflictions were due to "the caprices of their enlisted men, volunteers or conscripts, sometimes coarse, ignorant, and even brutal in spirit and conduct, who were on guard in charge of us, and even the officers themselves were at times compelled to carry out orders from those above them which they could not but regret. The Confederate prisoners on the floor above us were even more severely dealt with than ourselves." When nigh to death from innutrition in the Columbia prison Mr. Trumbull himself was supplied by a neighboring hotel-keeper with the food to which alone he attributes his recovery, the donor refusing to take a cent in payment.

The *Memories* furnish pleasing proof how common loyalty to the Union was at the South during the war. The author declares that he was never for any length of time in a company of Confederates without hearing expressions of tender regard for the old flag, and of hope that the Federal cause would win. In most sections a large minority, in some a majority, did not wish secession, and not a few even of those who voted for it did so with the most obscure and vague ideas of its meaning. Numbers of such Unionists were forced into the Confederate service notwithstanding, and fought with real bravery and with apparent zeal for the cause which they detested. The history of the war in this aspect can never be very fully written, since so many carried their loyalty as a sweet secret till death in battle or in hospital forever sealed their lips; so that students should make the most of such testimony in the matter as does in one way and another emerge.

E. BENJ. ANDREWS.

The War with Spain. By CHARLES MORRIS. (Philadelphia: The J. B. Lippincott Co. 1899. Pp. 383.)

Our Navy in the War with Spain. By JOHN R. SPEARS. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1899. Pp. xxii, 406.)

The Cuban and Porto Rican Campaigns. By RICHARD HARDING DAVIS. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1899. Pp. viii, 360.)

In Cuba with Shafter. By JOHN D. MILEY, Lieutenant-Colonel and Inspector-General, U. S. Volunteers, First Lieutenant, U. S. Artillery. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1899. Pp. xi, 228.)

Campaigning in Cuba. By GEORGE KENNAN. (New York: The Century Co. 1899. Pp. 269.)

With Sampson through the War. By A. M. GOODE. (New York: The Doubleday and McClure Co. 1899. Pp. 307.)

No history of contemporary events can be final. Mr. Morris's book gives a useful sketch of their sequence in the Spanish War, illustrated rather by pictures than by military charts. Skeleton histories are fast filling up with stories of personal experiences, and meanwhile Mr. Morris gives us a crisp narrative, breathing full-chested patriotism, and naturally exaggerating both the dangers and the exploits of what, after all said, remains a hyper-lucky war.

Ten days after the declaration of war, Dewey dared the plunging fire of Corregidor, and sailed into Manila Bay. Ignoring mines, he pushed safely through what the Spaniards should have made a fatal passage. He had superior ships; but Cavite carried twice as heavy guns, knowing which his act showed true American grit. Dewey believed in his ships, in his men. But Fortune smiled on him as she loves to smile on those only who compel her favors.

In 1865 we had the best navy in the world; in 1873 the worst, as Mr. Spears points out. How characteristic of our American happy-go-lucky habit! Trusting to expedients when the time shall come, we have so far escaped the penalty, but having now entered the European economy, must we not mend our ways? Our new navy was begun in 1882, but Congressional parsimony is illustrated in the nine shots per gun per year to which navy gunnery was limited. Roosevelt, when in the Navy Department, increased the allowance, and our gunners quickly perfected their natural aptitude for shooting straight. Well it was, for at best, naval gunnery is erratic: the destruction at Manila and Santiago was wrought by three per cent. of hits by the smaller, much less by the big guns. Though brave the Spaniards ceased to shoot well so soon as our guns opened. Indiscreet courage goes for little, and our enemy, from inability to handle their weapons, went down. Marksmanship, as Admiral Sampson points out in Mr. Goode's book, depends upon gun-captains who are good judges of distance and of the motion of the ships and who can quickly adjust their range-sights. We alone had these men.

The navy has an appreciative biographer in Mr. Spears. With its brilliant international triumphs, it always appeals to our patriotism as the army does not, and as a happy corollary it is, unlike the less spectacular infantry, rarely subjected to grievous loss. This detracts not one iota from the navy's due: every man stands ready to go down with his ship; but is it not wonderful that the achievements of 1898 could be purchased at a loss of only twenty men killed? Especially here does luck show up; for a single 10-inch shell might have sunk our biggest battle-ship. The fearlessness of the tars and the enterprise of the officers is illustrated by Mr. Spears in his narrative of the cable-cutting at Cienfuegos, of the marines at Guantanamo, of Hobson's splendid exploit (the pity of its injudicious praise!); of the tackling, by the *Yosemite* single-handed, of the *Lopez*, two cruisers, one torpedo boat and the forts at San Juan de Porto Rico, of the saving of life from sinking ships, and of many other exploits. And note that the so-called "bookworms" of the navy were neck-and-neck with the line.

Mr. Davis's book ought to be entitled "*What I saw* of the Cuban and Porto Rican Campaigns." Chatty and entertaining, it is a sort of picture-book (of which the hearsay is the least interesting) full of individual acts of bravery and with enough blood-spots to suit the lover of terrible war. The latest act of bravery is always the greatest. But it does not add to the effectiveness of a battle-tale to exaggerate the hotness of the fire or the heroism of the combatants. "Murderous fire" is measured by casualties. No words can overdraw the gallantry of the men whose business it is not, and yet who go forth to war. But is it true praise for a newspaper to talk of "one of the most brilliant assaults in history," when the killed and wounded are a bare dozen; or to talk of facing a "hellish" fire, when the total casualties are but eight per cent.? Scores of regiments in the Civil War lost over fifty per cent. in some one action, a few eighty per cent. To be sure they had Anglo-Saxons to face, and while still called "Volunteers," they had been trained into the very best of regulars. It is ungracious, so soon after the courageous exploits of to-day's heroes, to bring the matter down to statistics; but carping criticism on the general management of the war demands the reiteration of the fact that its battle casualties are exceptionally low; and that the loss by disease was far less than usual.

The Spanish War lasted a "short term" from the declaration of war to protocol, or a "long term" of about one year. In round figures the average killed and wounded per week per 100,000 under arms, was 60 for short term, 30 for long term; during the Civil War it was over 350. Deaths from all causes for short term were 150, long term 75; during the Civil War 230.

These figures do not prove the conduct of the war immaculate; that is another question; but they prove trifling the losses which yellow journalism has so unnecessarily flaunted in the eyes of the universe.

In another sense the war losses have been insignificant. In 1898, in the United States, nearly as many people were killed by lightning as were killed in battle; more passengers were injured in railroad accidents than wounded in battle. Six times as many were killed by explosions, accidents in mines and falling buildings; six times as many in fires; ten times as many were drowned, not including marine disasters. In fact love drove to suicide as many as battle-lust claimed. But the usual fails to impress us; the unusual always strikes the imagination.

It would be unreasonable to curb the hyperbole of the war-correspondent who fearlessly accompanies the fighting line. Much as the work of the Rough Riders has been before the public, it can scarcely be overpraised. In its ranks were men whose motto was solely "Noblesse Oblige," and men to whom a shooting affray was but the condiment of daily life. Under such leaders as Wood and Roosevelt, how should the Rough Riders not make a record? There is no need to praise the regular. We know him and what we can always look to him to do. But we owe a debt to all volunteers which we are glad to pay, and which we shall not be allowed to forget.

Mr. Davis's fondness for criticism is fairly leashed, except in speaking of the conduct of the Santiago campaign—his pet horror. The critic is free from trammels and possesses facts which the commander ignored; and thus equipped (I speak from ancient experience) criticism becomes so easy that as one gains knowledge one becomes more tolerant. No doubt the Santiago campaign bristles with errors. The transports did sail in careless order; the landing of the troops for lack of boats was haphazard; the handling of supplies might have been better managed; it would have been well had General Shafter remained in robust health. But this was not purely a military campaign; it was a race against disease, a manœuvre which ought to have failed, and but for the Providence which watches over American destinies would have failed. Had Santiago been but half defended, our attack would have been thrust back. An immense levy of raw troops, supplies hastily collected and put in charge of new-made officers (even a Wanamaker's success comes from and depends on trained subordinates), lack of preparation in every department, a deadly climate, political ideas to the fore,—what was the apparent chance of success in Cuba? When politics holds most of the trumps in the game of war, soldiers cannot take all the tricks. And yet we won, by crude, crass luck—supplemented by gallant if not perfect management and weak opposition. If to-day's journalistic searchlights had been turned on most of the successful campaigns of the past, we should see material for criticism of even the greatest commanders, in comparison with which all allegations against Shafter would seem puerile. The good old days of war when the leader marched out, conscious that if he returned successful he was above criticism, have passed and gone.

But the public has its rights. Even Napoleon was criticized—though he took good care it should not be by war-correspondents.

Mr. Davis's description of the San Juan and El Caney fights is picturesque. Luckily the Spaniards did not hold their rifle-pits, as the Confederates did at Fredericksburg. These fights have been claimed to be the soldiers', not the commanders', battles. So have been many others; and yet Thapsus remains Cæsar's, Mission Ridge Grant's victory.

That the Porto Rico campaign was better planned was due to General Miles having substantially his own way; that it succeeded was largely due to a more friendly population. The pages devoted to Porto Rico are pleasant reading.

Dewey's success in Manila, in passing, owes much to distance. Had he been in Cuban waters, who can presage equal military and popular success? Even Marlborough could gain no victories until he got beyond the control of the Dutch deputies; Nelson had no need to cut a cable. Every disease has its sequelae. The Manila disease, according to the people's diagnosis, was broken up on May 1; but the sequelae threaten to be serious and lasting. Gallant Montojo was annihilated with eight wounded on our side; since then, in perhaps only the first steps of our occupation, some 1600 have been killed and wounded; and something over 300 men have died of disease. Despite our hopes of speedy Filipino collapse, the American people will be happy if our Asian colony does not become a national cemetery.

The military student turns with pleasure and profit to the even-handed, keen statement of facts by Colonel Miley of the headquarters staff, whose soldierly leaven gives authority to every page. Writing as an advocate, Colonel Miley would have made a less good case; General Shafter is happy in his historian. The maps supply a marked need, as the accentuation of the ground and the movements are carefully set down. No space is devoted to personal details. The facts are clearly and conservatively given, and the reader finds these such as to need no bolstering by argument. Some things are left unsaid, but the book is not penned to satisfy the press

Shafter was handicapped. His destination and purpose were uncertain until almost the last days at Tampa. Orders were of necessity changeable. The volunteers were but half equipped, and supplies came in piece-meal. One train brought meat; another coffee; a third hard bread. There was no place to store and select the rations, and scant time in which to victual the transports. Artillery, arms and ammunition arrived from different arsenals, and each gun had to be assembled. Wharfage was limited. Water on the transports was used by the troops already on board and awaiting final orders, which were alternately for speed or delay. The one railroad track was insufficient, and yet trains of sightseers and friends and relations blocked this track much of the time. Correspondents who must be tolerated gave away important information, though, be it said to his credit, the high-grade correspondent respected himself in respecting the limitations imposed by honor. Despite all, our first foreign expedition of 16,000 men, after orders as contradictory as the phantom cruise of Cervera, was got off with fair speed, arrived safely and was disembarked (thanks to the navy) without loss. It might have been done better, says the civilian critic; but was there not room for much more blundering? War is hide-and-seek in the dark. It is a question of who will make the fewest blunders. Once ashore, lusty Wheeler pressed on and won the fight at Las Guasimas. Thence the advance was pushed by Shafter's able lieutenants, over almost impracticable ground, to contact with the enemy; headquarters was moved June 30 to a point whence El Caney and San Juan hill could be seen, and the battle of July 1 supervened. From landing to winning a battle which necessitated the surrender of Santiago was but a week. To ration the troops over apologies for roads, with transportation lamentably inefficient, was a serious undertaking, and fever was sure to come within a month. No soldier maintains that Shafter's management was perfect. Tried by the measure applied by critics to this one, it might be hard to find a perfect campaign in history. War must as a rule be gauged by success; and if we could imagine Shafter beyond interference, and accomplishing what he did without the criticism of newspapers, of inexperienced officers, of hungry men who had thrown away their rations rather than carry them, and of hysterical friends at home, and all this at a loss far below the average, should we not have yielded him the proper meed of praise? Imagine the movement with regulars alone, used to hardship and expecting it, and unaccompanied by correspondents who must furnish copy for glowing headlines—would there have been much fault found? It is an axiom that the work of able subordinates redounds to the commander's credit—and Shafter's subordinates were highly efficient.

In a number of chapters which are easy, agreeable reading, Mr. Kennan gives a much-needed account of the doings of the Red Cross, and his personal adventures when quarantined in Santiago lend a crisp idea of what manner of city it then was. He dilates on the gigantic preparations of the press, on their fifteen or twenty big despatch-boats and numerous small launches; on the herculean labors performed and risks run by the correspondents in furnishing early advices of what was going on; and on the vast sums and facilities put at their disposal. Despite Manila censorship, we surely need not doubt the freedom of the press! The old-fashioned military student has learned that no success can be expected unless the commander is an autocrat, and he looks aghast at the modern army of critics swarming around headquarters. Now that electricity can put the general in hourly communication with the War Department, it is doubtful whether ever again there can be wars on the old plan, where, for the time being, real power is committed to one man.

In Mr. Kennan's book much stress is laid on the lack of supplies, on the things the soldier had to do without. Turning back to an old diary kept during the Civil War, I find, in 1862 and 1863, when our war was many months old, incidents which might be bodily transferred to any of the books under review. Though wearing shoulderstraps, I often went without hard-tack on the march; I was once reduced to wheat-kernels gathered in the fields; to have enough crackers, salt pork and coffee to keep from gnawing hunger was deemed unusual luxury; beef rarely reached me; and as to cooking, the ubiquitous tin cup and nature's tools sufficed. We worked, sick or well; as to medical attendance, I once lay four days wounded without any. Nor was my case unusual. War is always hell—to which rule there is no exception. The soldiers, aye and the officers, of the best equipped army that since the days of Philip of Macedon has ever started on a campaign, the Prussian army in 1870 to wit, all went hungry time and time again. Even Bismarck himself, in wealthy France, was more than once at a loss for a bite to appease his hunger—vide his memoirs.

We owe much to Mr. Kennan for his interesting work, in which he opens up and cultivates a new field in a most efficient manner; but he will pardon us if we refrain from taking his criticism of the Santiago campaign too seriously. Overmuch of it is hearsay. Its tendency is, however, the same that is preached by all the war-books, that unless we learn now, as we never have in the past, to keep prepared in earnest, all our future wars will be more full of hardship, and probably of disaster, than the last one.

Admiral Sampson possesses a staunch champion in Mr. Goode, who, as correspondent of the Associated Press, was aboard the flagship *New York*, and gives us numberless details about the daily life on our battleships. The successive books on the Spanish War are much like the once fashionable *air varié;* and the variations played on the original theme are as diverting as they are numerous. Considerable space is devoted to the unfortunate journalistic Sampson-Schley controversy. After all said, the commanding admiral is entitled to the lion's share of the prize-money and the credit. If fleets are to be homogeneous bodies, no other rule will do.

The chapter by Admiral Sampson himself is noteworthy as showing how completely outclassed Cervera was. We had three first-class and two second-class battle-ships, two armored cruisers and two improvised torpedo-boat destroyers; the enemy had but four armored cruisers and two torpedo-boat destroyers. Still our speedy victory was due to superior gunnery and our national habit of confidence. Had the forces been reversed, we might yet have won. Captain Evans, in an equally interesting chapter, sums up the lessons of the war as a need of long distance and fast cruisers, torpedo-boat destroyers, and colliers; a need of smokeless powder and fuel, a good range-finder, and better communication in and between ships.

So much has been written about this war that there is scant room for Mr. Goode or for anyone else to say anything distinctly new; but the book is remunerative reading. It might be added that the plethora of war criticism has equally forestalled any novelty from the pen of a reviewer.

THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE.

The History of South America from its Discovery to the Present Time, compiled from the Works of the best Authors and from authentic Documents, many hitherto unpublished, in various Archives and public and private Libraries in America and Spain. By an American. Translated from the Spanish by ADNAH H. JONES. (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co.; New York: The Macmillan Co. 1899. Pp. viii, 345.)

THIS ostentatious title masks a fraud. The anonymous author of the *Historia de la America del Sur, desde su descubrimiento hasta nuestros dias*, etc., etc., *por un Americano* (Barcelona, 1878), which a confiding translator has now given to the English public, solved the perplexities of research and original composition by lifting bodily the work of Alfred Deberle, *Histoire de l'Amérique du Sud, depuis la Conquête jusqu'à nos Jours*, 2ème éd., Paris, 1876). Occasionally a paragraph is added, here and there a page; of more considerable additions there are two: the earlier pages of Chapter IV. on colonization are excerpted from Robertson's *America* without any indication of the fact, and pp. 312–330 are not in Deberle. The opening and closing sentences of some of the chapters will show the nature of the plagiarism as well as anything short of a comparison of both volumes in detail.

History of South America.	*Histoire de l'Amérique du Sud.*
P. 139, "Columbia is called to fill at no distant date one of the first positions among the nations of South America."	P. 142, "la Colombie peut occuper un jour le premier rang parmi les peuples du Sud-Amérique."
P. 140, "The republic of Nueva Granada showed that it had acted with the greatest prudence by refraining from employing force to retain Venezuela in the union."	P. 143, "La Nouvelle-Granade avait agi sagement en n'essayant pas de retenir Vénézuela par la force, dans une union."
P. 154, "battles not very sanguinary, in truth, and which, it must be admitted, do not at all resemble those terrible encounters which stain with blood the streets of European capitals."	P. 161, "batailles peu sanglantes, il est vrai, et qui ne ressemblent guère, a-t-on besoin de le dire, à ces chocs terribles dont retentissent encore après tant d'années les boulevards et les rues de nos capitales."
P. 293, "Of all the republics which were formed in America on the emancipation of the Spanish colonies, Chili has had the least chequered existence."	P. 338, "De toutes les républiques sorties de l'émancipation des colonies espagnoles, la République du Chili est celle qui a reçu en partage l'existence la moins accidentée."

These brief citations are merely examples taken at random for illustration. It is clear from them that Mr. Jones has given us a faithful rendering of his Spanish text. One cannot but lament, however, that his labor should have been thus expended, when the same effort would have enabled him to make accessible to English readers the new edition of Deberle which has been revised and brought down to date by Alfred Milhaud (Paris, 1897). That Deberle's work sorely needed revision in the chapter on the discoveries will be instantly perceived by every student who examines the present volume, and it is not less obvious that a History of South America "to the present time" ought not to end in 1876. Mr. Jones is evidently a novice in history and geography or else he would have been staggered by such assertions as the following which appear in his text: "The Scandinavians settled successively in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia as well as in Massachusetts and Rhode Island, keeping up communications with these countries until the middle of the fourteenth century," p. 1; or this "Three days after setting sail Columbus arrived at the Canaries," etc. Deberle is responsible for the first of these extraordinary statements, but not for the second, which is one of only two cases, so far as I have noticed, in which the process of double translation has betrayed the original. My eye has not fallen on any glaring errors in Deberle's chapters on the history of the South American states and this part of his work will be found to contain a clear and concise account of their political life during the first two generations of their independence.

In view of the facts in the case, Mr. Jones and his publishers can hardly do less, in justice to Deberle and to the public, than to change the title-page so that the book will seem to be what it is, a translation of Deberle with slight additions. Would it, however, be too much to ask of Mr. Jones that he revise and extend his text so as to conform to Milhaud's improved edition? He would then give the public something for which it can be more sincerely grateful than for this version of a Spanish translation of an antiquated original.

EDWARD G. BOURNE.

The Homeric Palace, by Norman Morrison Isham, A.M., Architect (Providence, The Preston and Rounds Company, 1898, pp. viii, 72). This little book is a brief discussion, with illustrative sketches, of the architectural questions which have been raised by the Mycenaean excavations. The problem that the author sets himself, pp. 4, 5, 6, is to combine the testimony of the Homeric poems in regard to the dwellings of the chieftains with that of the excavations at Troy, Mycenae, Tiryns and Gha, and then by process of comparison to evolve a typical Homeric palace. To solve such a problem as this with any completeness in the space of seventy-two small pages is obviously impossible, and the evidence derived from the poems is not discussed at all. The result is that we have a study of the *Mycenaean* palace with a little Homer thrown in, and a constant tendency to lose sight of the distinction at first recognized between what is Mycenaean and what is Homeric. We are told, for example, p. 18, that the "great shields which the Homeric heroes carried" were "a sort of leather semi-cylinder held in front, reaching from head to heel, and from side to side," a view which from the evidence of the poems it would be hard to maintain without important modification. In spite of Reichel's brilliant treatise, statements about the Homeric as distinguished from the Mycenaean shield may well be couched in terms at least as cautious as those of Tsountas and Manatt, *Mycenaean Age*, p. 210, and even the over-conservative views of Ridgeway, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XVI. 115, are not to be lightly set aside. In spite, however, of Mr. Isham's too great inclination to regard the question of the relation of the Homeric to the Mycenaean civilization as *res adjudicata*, his book ought to be interesting and useful to teachers who have not the opportunity of studying the more extensive architectural discussions of Adler, Dörpfeld and Chipiez. His indication, too, for it is hardly more than this, of the resemblance between the feudal castle of Northern Europe and the palace of the Mycenaean chieftain will be suggestive to many. It seems, indeed, a pity that this side of the subject has not been more fully worked out. A few good plans on a larger scale of typical English and French castles, and some discussion of their general features with reference to similar Mycenaean structures, would be interesting and instructive.

The general appearance of Mr. Isham's book would be improved by the omission of many unnecessary and some really barbarous transliterations. The spelling, too, of classic names could be reduced to some system with advantage; alongside of Mycenae and Mycenaean are Abai and Lykian, and we have Propylaea and Achaian, Telemachus and Eumaios, etc. On p. 46 Chipiez's name should surely be mentioned in touching on the architectural theories of Perrot and Chipiez's *Histoire*. Mr. Isham's illustrations are good, but one wishes they might have been larger.

J. R. Wheeler.

The second Abtheilung of the eighth volume of Dahn's *Koenige der Germanen* (Leipzig, Breitkopf and Härtel, pp. xvi, 265) begins the institutional history of the Carolingian period. The Abtheilung is a short one, as compared with those of the volume on Merovingian institutions, and is concerned, except for a few pages at the end, with two topics only—first the fundamental questions of land and people, and second the distinctions of rank and class. The first discusses the political divisions of the state and the tribal divisions of the people, especially the relation of the Franks to the remaining population of the state. Nearly 200 pages are occupied with the second topic, dealing with the nobles, the common freemen, and the dependent classes. This last includes the author's treatment of the feudal institutions of the period. On this subject Dahn is in general agreement with the current opinion, but has his own views on many points of detail which, following his usual custom, he states in a very bald and dogmatic manner.

The Royal Historical Society has sent out Vol. XII. of its *Transactions* (Longmans, pp. 289). Sir Mountstuart E. Grant Duff, in his presidential address, pursues the plan upon which he entered in 1893, of discussing the extent to which the modern statesman can be directly helped by the study of some of the great writers of antiquity. Cicero is his theme this year, and is discussed in a most entertaining manner. The longest piece in the volume is an elaborate dissertation on the battle of Marston Moor, by Mr. C. H. Firth, who devotes himself especially, and with that fullness of knowledge of Civil War matters for which he is noted, to four questions: that of the numbers and composition of the two armies; that of the order in which the forces on each side were drawn up; that of the tactics of Cromwell and the cavalry; and that of the nature and value of the authorities for the history of the battle. Next follow two interesting papers on naval history, one by Professor Laughton, on the lessons of national importance which may be drawn from the naval history of England, the other, by Mr. Hubert Hall of the Public Record Office, on its sources. Mr. A. E. Stamp contributes a note, founded chiefly on the despatches of John Robinson, on the visit which Marlborough paid to Charles XII. at Alt-Ranstadt in April, 1707. The paper on the Sheriff's Farm, by G. J. Turner, exhibits an enormous amount of work and contains some interesting details, but it is not easy to grasp his general conclusions. His main object is to explain the difference between payments made by tale, *i. e.*, in silver pennies, and payments in blanched silver, *i. e.*, tested silver of a certain fineness. This difference is of some importance for an understanding of the sheriffs' farms and accounts which have come down to us in the Pipe Rolls. Another elaborate study in the volume is that of Miss E. Dixon on the Florentine Wool Trades in the Middle Ages, in which she accounts for the development of those industries in a place so unfavorably situated, and traces the development of the manufacture and export which for so long a time made Florence supreme throughout Europe in the woollen industry. Finally, Miss Margaret Morison presents a narrative, curious and interesting but much in need of annotation, of a visit which the Swedish princess Cecilia, second daughter of Gustavus Vasa, paid to the Court of Queen Elizabeth in 1565–1566. The narrative is derived from a contemporary English manuscript drawn up at the instance of the princess, and is supplemented by her letters, by letters of the Spanish ambassador to his master and by others.

In the REVIEW for October, 1898, mention was made of the appearance of the privately printed group of papers by Mr. J. H. Round severely criticizing Mr. Hubert Hall's edition in the Roll Series of the *Red Book of the Exchequer*, and somewhat bitterly attacking Mr. Hall himself. Mr. Hall after long silence retaliated in kind in two papers which, it is but fair to say, have been distributed privately, not sent for review. These have in turn been answered by Mr. Round in a second pamphlet. Of the personalities we have nothing to say except to regret that personal controversy, so common in some fields of scientific work, should make an entrance into the world of historical study, which so far has been almost free from such waste of good energy.

As to the really important question at issue, the excellence or the defectiveness of the official edition of the *Red Book of the Exchequer*, Mr. Hall shows that some of the charges of mistake are themselves mistaken, others are differences of scholarly opinion, others again are somewhat unfair inferences, and still others are simply typographical errors in the preface. In his second paper he defends himself, we think successfully, against the charge of carelessness or ignorance in two important points which have been criticized by Mr. Round, and by Mr. Poole in the

English Historical Review. Mr. Hall acknowledges, however, as he must do, a residuum of deficiencies which he regrets but partially excuses by the peculiar difficulties of the conditions under which he worked. To sum up the results of the controversy, which it is to be hoped is now closed: It has been shown that the book referred to has defects which are unfortunate, which diminish its value quite perceptibly, but which are not either so numerous or so important as may have been at first supposed, or as the statements of Mr. Hall's principal critic suggest. But few critical editions have ever been subjected to so close and searching a revision by a second scholar of such abilities and training; and it is to be feared that but few would emerge from the test with unshaken credit. It is only to be regretted that this minute re-examination might not have been put at the disposal of the scholarly world by embodiment in the official edition; or in lieu of that, in the form of a review article which should include a list of the defects and of their corrections.

The Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1897 (Washington, Government Printing Office) is a portly volume of 1272 pages. Some three hundred of these are occupied with the second annual report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, which has been separately reviewed upon an earlier page. A hundred pages are devoted to a detailed bibliographical list of maps illustrating the topography of the region disputed by Venezuela and British Guiana, which has been prepared by Mr. P. Lee Phillips, superintendent of maps and charts in the Library of Congress. The last five hundred pages of the volume are devoted to a bibliography of Alabama, by Mr. Thomas M. Owen, secretary of the Alabama Historical Society. This bibliography includes, in great detail, books and pamphlets relating to the history of the territory now called Alabama and to the biography of its public men, Alabama imprints if deemed important by the compiler, and the writings of natives and inhabitants of the state. The compiler's own library has furnished a large part of the items, and other collections, public and private, have been ransacked with evident care. The scope of the bibliography seems not to have been defined at all points with perfect precision, but this is always difficult, and the collection as it stands must always be of incalculable benefit to all students of Alabama history.

The earlier pages of the volume are filled with the papers read at the Cleveland meeting, or with papers then offered and "read by title." Those of the former class have been already summarized in this review (III. 405–417). Of the latter class the most interesting seems to us to be: Dr. J. C. Ballagh's account of the land-system in the Southern colonies, affirmed, very properly, to be a topic fundamental to any serious study of the economic history of the South; Dr. J. M. Callahan's paper on Cuba and Anglo-American relations in the period from 1819 to 1829; Dr. J. H. Latane's more elaborate treatment of the diplomacy of the United States with regard to Cuba; and Dr. Bernard C. Steiner's interesting discussion of the Protestant revolution of 1689 in Maryland.

Hon. W. A. Courtenay, of South Carolina, reprints, with an introduction, "An Inquiry into the Propriety of Establishing a National Observatory," printed in 1827 by Professor James C. Courtenay, of Charleston, the first public appeal from a private citizen for the erection of an astronomical observatory in the Union.

The chapters of Mr. Lecky's *History of England in the Eighteenth Century* which treat of the American Revolution, though forming one of the most instructive and judicious histories of the Revolution that has been written, have not hitherto been accessible except in the complete work. Now, under the editorship of Professor James Albert Woodburn, of Indiana University, these chapters and passages have been gathered together and published as a separate volume under the (half) title of *The American Revolution, 1763–1783* (New York, Appleton, pp. xxvi, 518). Though intended primarily for use as a text-book, the volume can not fail to find its way into the hands of many who are not university students, and into libraries to which the complete work would never come, thereby doing much, as Professor Woodburn trusts, to remove or avoid any false and exaggerated conceptions of British despotism and tyranny that may yet remain, while at the same time carrying conviction that the resistance of the Americans contributed, as Fox said, "to preserve the liberties of mankind." The editor has prefixed a brief bibliography (pp. xi.–xviii.) of some of the important primary and secondary English and American authorities on the period. He has added also some fifteen pages of notes upon the text. The notes consist chiefly in occasional references to American authorities, or in quotations from them, and especially at points where in the view of the author Mr. Lecky has been "unduly severe or hostile in his criticism of the American cause or actors in the Revolution." Taken as a whole the notes form a very useful addition to the book, though they seem to be distributed somewhat arbitrarily or accidentally. Excepting occasional suggestions to students the editor gives little comment of his own. Where pages and passages not bearing on American history have been omitted this has been mentioned in the notes, but it would seem that some mark of omission should also be found in the text.

E. C. B.

History of State Banking in Maryland, by Alfred Cookman Bryan, Ph.D. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in History and Political Science; Series XVII, Nos, 1, 2, 3] (pp. 144.) We are indebted to Mr. Bryan for the addition of another and important chapter to the history of banking in this country previous to the adoption of the national banking system. It is the familiar story of experimental legislation, lax supervision by the state and consequent loose and sometimes fraudulent practices by bank managers, marked, however, by gradual improvement, resulting during the later years of the period in the establishment of a fairly satisfactory system.

Maryland made no contribution to the development of either sound legislation or practice comparable in importance to what was accomplished in Massachusetts, New York or Louisiana, but its experience, as presented by Mr. Bryan, is none the less instructive. Specially worthy of note is his account of the part imposed on the banks by the state in carrying out its schemes for internal improvements, of the taxation of banks for the support of the school fund, and of the close relation between the development of banking and the general industrial movement which he clearly brings out. Mr. Bryan's treatment is systematic, and he has apparently done his work in an adequate manner on the whole, though his material does not seem to be always well digested, and his statements are sometimes lacking in clearness. It is difficult, *e. g.*, to get, from apparently contradictory statements on pages 50 and 53, a clear idea of the facts in regard to the depreciation of the notes of the Maryland banks in 1815.

H. B. G.

One may question the appropriateness of including Mr. Amos K. Fiske's *The West Indies* (G P. Putnam's Sons, pp. xii, 414) in the well-known series of the "Story of the Nations," for the obvious reason that those islands do not form a nation, never have, and probably never will. The book itself is a facile compilation of the essentials of West Indian geography and history to "meet the needs of that numerous but undefinable person 'the general reader.'" It betrays no intimate knowledge of the subject and is drawn exclusively from sources in the English language. Two of the best of these, it may be noted in passing, Madden's *Island of Cuba* (London, 1849) and Levy's Cabrera's *Cuba and the Cubans*, have escaped the author's attention. The historical portion of his work is slight in texture and unsatisfactory in quality. The sketch of Cuban history, for example, closely follows Ramsey's imperfect outline in Rowan and Ramsey's *Island of Cuba*, even to the mistake of assigning the Black Warrior episode to the year 1850. Mr. Fiske seems entirely unaware that Cuba was represented in the Córtes from 1812 to 1834. The relaxation of the restrictions on Cuban commerce he apparently attributes exclusively to the conscious policy of the French domination in Spain in 1808. It is true that the colonial monopoly broke down at that time, but the policy of open trade was begun by royal decree in 1794. It was not, however, permanently adopted until 1818.

Consultation of so accessible a book as John Fiske's *Discovery of America* would have saved the author from contributing his mite to perpetuate the error of explaining Hispaniola as "Little Spain." Columbus expressly says in his Journal (Dec. 9) "puso nombre à la dicha isla la isla Española," showing beyond doubt that "Española" is the adjective, "Spanish," and not the diminutive. The so-called Moro portrait of Columbus is reproduced and described as "Painted in 1542 at the court of Philip II. of Spain." Moro went to Madrid in 1552, Philip came to the throne in 1555, and the portrait is generally assigned to the year 1570 or thereabout.

E. G. B.

NOTES AND NEWS

The report of the "Committee of Seven" on the teaching of history in schools has just been published (Macmillan Co.) as a small volume.

In view of the approaching fortieth anniversary of the beginning of the professorial activity of Professor Pasquale Villari, an international committee has been organized at Florence, under the direction of Professor Alberto del Vecchio, to receive contributions toward a "Villari Fund" for the support of historical researches. American contributions may be sent to Professor E. R. A. Seligman, Columbia University, New York.

Professor Charles L. Wells, of the University of Minnesota, has resigned to become dean of the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral at New Orleans. Dr. Albert B. White, instructor in Yale University, has been chosen in his place.

The North Central History Teachers' Association was founded at Chicago on April 1, 1899, at a meeting of about a hundred teachers of history in schools and colleges in the region indicated. Semi-annual meetings, in October and at Easter, are proposed. Professor Charles H. Haskins of the University of Wisconsin was chosen president, and Mr. Harry S. Vaile of the Hyde Park High School, Chicago, secretary.

The American Catholic organization known as the Knights of Columbus have agreed to establish at the Catholic University of America at Washington a chair of American history. The Ancient Order of Hibernians has already founded there a chair of Celtic language, literature, history and antiquities.

In the *Zeitschrift für Kulturgeschichte*, VI. 4–5, the editor, Dr. Georg Steinhausen, begins a bibliography of the publications of 1898 (books, pamphlets and articles in journals), in the history of civilization.

Part XXI. of Dr. Poole's *Historical Atlas of Modern Europe* contains maps of the Netherlands, by Dr. J. Fredericks; of Southeastern Europe and Asia Minor, *circa* 1200, by Professor J. B. Bury; and of the European Colonies and Dependencies after the Peace of Utrecht, by Mr. H. E. Egerton.

The pages of "Contemporary History" (1848–1898) which Professor Edwin A. Grosvenor of Amherst College added to his translation of Duruy's *History of the World* recently published, have been issued separately by the publishers of that volume, Messrs. T. Y. Crowell and Co., under the title, *Contemporary History of the World* (pp. ix, 183).

ANCIENT HISTORY.

The publisher A. Hettler, of Leipzig, has founded and will conduct a journal devoted entirely to ancient history, *Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte*, of which six or eight *Hefte* will be published annually, at the price of twenty marks. The first number contains a general introductory article by R. von Scala; a general review of the treatment of ancient history during the present century, by J. Jung; an account of the latest investigations in Egyptian history, by A. Wiedemann; and a brief article in source-criticism, chiefly relating to Livy, by W. Soltau.

The Temple of Mut in Asher (Scribner, pp. 391), by Margaret Benson and Jane Gray, gives an account of the temple and its contents, with the purpose of illustrating Egyptian history and the religious ideas of the Egyptians. The inscriptions and translations are by Percy E. Newberry.

Dr. Frederic J. Bliss's *Excavations at Jerusalem, 1894–'97*, published at London by the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, is a record of the valuable work which this young American archaeologist has done in tracing the old walls and boundaries of Jerusalem, on its south side, at various ages.

Professor Charles Foster Kent's *History of the Jewish People during the Babylonian, Persian and Greek Periods* (Scribner, pp. 380), previously announced in these pages, has now appeared.

German and Austrian publications relating to Greek history, and brought out between 1886 and 1898, are reviewed by Professor Adolf Bauer of Gratz in the May number of the *Revue Historique*. The article is to be continued in a later number. Dr. Bauer also publishes through C. H. Beck of Munich a general review of a decade's work in Greek history, *Die Forschungen zur griechischen Geschichte*, 1888–1898 (pp. 573).

In the *Annual* of the British School at Athens, No. 3, Mr. C. Smith gives a general account of the excavations conducted by the school on the island of Melos, while a considerable number of the details of the results are considered in more special contributions. In the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XVIII. 2, Mr. G. C. Richards presents a general review of archaeological investigations in Greece in 1897–1898.

The Clarendon Press produces a treatise on *The Palaeography of Greek Papyri*, by Mr. Frederic G. Kenyon, assistant keeper of manuscripts in the British Museum, who has made himself so distinguished a reputation in this field.

The second volume in Messrs. Methuen's series of Byzantine Texts will be the History of Psellus, edited by C. Sathas.

The thirteenth volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* is begun, with a fasciculus devoted to the inscriptions of Aquitania and Lugdunensis, edited by Otto Hirschfeld (Berlin, G. Reimer, pp. xxxviii, 519).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Meyer, *Die Sklaverei im Alterthum* (Jahrbuch der Gehe-Stiftung, 1899); E. Kornemann, *Der Einfluss Ægyptens über das römische Reich* (Neue Jahrbücher, II. 1); J. P. Waltzing, *Les Collèges Funéraires chez les Romains* (Le Musée Belge, 1898, 4); M. S. Muller, *De Civitates van Gallië* (Verhandelingen der k. Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, II. 1–2); F. V. Dickins, *The Origins of the Japanese State* (English Historical Review, April).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY.

The Vienna Academy's *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* now includes a first volume (the first thirteen books) of Augustine *De Civitate Dei*, edited by Emanuel Hoffmann (Vienna, F. Tempsky, pp. 660).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Father Pargoire, *Les Débuts du Monachisme à Constantinople* (Revue des Question Historiques, January); P. Allard, *L'Épiscopat de Saint Basile* (Revue des Question Historiques, January).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

Dr. Hans Schnorr von Carolsfeld, librarian of the University of Munich, and Professor Anton Chroust of Würzburg announce the publication of a series of fac-similes of medieval manuscripts, with accompanying transcripts and other letter-press, to be entitled *Monumenta Palaeographica*. Subscriptions (at ten marks per *Heft* of twenty plates) may be sent to Messrs. F. Bruckmann of Munich. The parts will be published at intervals of two months.

The firm of Wagner at Innsbruck has begun the publication of Dr. Engelbrecht Mühlbacher's new edition of Böhmer's "Regesta," *Die Regesten des Kaiserreichs unter den Karolingern*, Bd. I., Abth. 1 (pp. 480).

The Hakluyt Society announces for next year *The Journeys to Tartary of John of Plano Carpini and William of Rubruk*, translated and edited by Mr. W. W. Rockhill, at present United States minister in Athens.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: O. Dippe, *Der Prolog der Lex Salica, die Entstehung der Lex und die salischen Franken* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, II. 2); H. Brunner, *Nobiles und Gemeinfreie der karolingischen Volksrechte* (Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germ. Abth., 19); J. von Pflugk-Harttung, *Die Anfänge des Johanniter Herrenmeisterthums* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, II. 2); R. Behrend, *Das Ungejährwerk in der Geschichte des Seerechts* (Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germ. Abth, 19).

GREAT BRITAIN.

The government has issued the *Calendar of the Close Rolls* for 1333–1337; and a volume of the *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, for 1672.

With the aid of an influential advisory committee, and under the editorial direction of Mr. H. Arthur Doubleday and Mr. G. Laurence Gomme, Messrs. Archibald Constable and Co., of 2 Whitehall Gardens, Westminster, propose the issue of a most elaborate series of county histories, to be called *The Victoria History of the Counties of England.* The history of each county will, upon the average, occupy four volumes at a cost of six guineas for each county, or perhaps £250 for the whole set. The plan contemplates the treatment, for each county, of its geology, natural history, pre-historic, Roman and Anglo-Saxon remains, ethnography, architecture, Domesday, topographical details for each parish and manor, the history of its leading families, and its ecclesiastical, political, maritime, literary and economic history. There will be elaborate illustration by maps, coats of arms, portraits, characteristic views, etc. The portions relating to Domesday and the feudal families are to be entrusted to Mr. J. Horace Round, and in general, great efforts will be made to secure that each section is treated by a competent specialist.

Westminster Abbey, an historic description by Mr. H. J. Feasey, with an account of the Abbey buildings, by J. T. Micklethwaite, is among the announcements of the Macmillan Co.

Side by side with the useful series of volumes of *English History from Contemporary Writers*, Mr. David Nutt has begun the issue of a series of *Scottish History from Contemporary Writers*, the two volumes already brought out being one on the times of James IV., edited by Mr. G. Gregory Smith, and one on Mary Queen of Scots, by Mr. R. S. Rait.

During the present summer Mr. J. Horace Round will publish a book on the origin of the London Corporation.

The Pipe Roll Society's Vol. XXIV. contains the *Feet of Fines in the Public Record Office for the Ninth Year of King Richard I.*

In the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, LIX. 5, MM. Mirot and Deprez present an instructive history of the English embassies to the Continent (France, the Holy See, Germany and Spain) from 1327 to 1360, from materials derived from the exchequer-accounts in the Public Record Office.

The Oxford Historical Society has brought out at the Clarendon Press two volumes of *Epistolae Academicae Oxonienses* (*Registrum F.*), a collection of letters and other miscellaneous documents illustrative of academical life and studies at Oxford in the fifteenth century, edited by the Rev. Henry Anstey, of Queen's College.

The Selden Society has published as its twelfth issue a volume of *Select Cases in the Court of Requests*, 1497 1569, edited by Mr. I. S. Leadam (London, Quaritch, pp. cxxiv, 242). Vol. XIII., for 1899, will be a volume of *Select Pleas of the Forest*, edited by Mr. G. J. Turner. Vol. XIV., for 1900, will be a volume on the municipal records of Lincoln and Beverley, by Mr. A F. Leach. Later the year books of Edward II. will be attacked.

Under the general editorship of Mr. Spenser Wilkinson, Messrs. Lawrence and Bullen are about to publish a volume of military sketches entitled *From Cromwell to Wellington—Twelve Soldiers* with an introduction by Lord Roberts. The twelve soldiers are: Cromwell, Marlborough, Peterborough, Wolfe, Clive, Coote, Heathfield, Abercromby, Lake, Baird, Moore and Wellington; and the writers are British military officers of high competence. A similar naval volume is in preparation.

The second volume of Mr. Osmund Airy's edition of Burnet's *History of My Own Time* (Clarendon Press) may be expected shortly.

Mr. John Murray announces a biographical sketch of Dean Milman, by his son, Mr. Arthur Milman, with selections from the dean's correspondence.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Dom L. Lévêque, *Saint Augustin de Cantorbéry; Première Mission Bénédictine* (Revue des Questions Historiques, April); R. S. Rait, *Andrew Melville and the Revolt against Aristotle in Scotland* (English Historical Review, April); J. R. Tanner, *The Administration of the Navy from the Restoration to the Revolution*, III. (English Historical Review, April); *Slavery in Modern Scotland* (Edinburgh Review, January).

FRANCE.

M. Pierre de Tourtoulon, in his *Œuvres de Jacques de Révigny* (Paris, Marescq), has essayed, after careful study of the manuscript lectures on the Digest, written by Jacques, and still preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale, to restore to his true place of importance the most celebrated professor of law at the school of Orleans in the thirteenth century.

Under the auspices of the Swiss federal government, M. Édouard Rott will publish (Bern, Collin), an important work in nine volumes entitled: *Histoire de la Représentation Diplomatique de la France auprès des Cantons Suisses, de leurs Alliés et Confédérés.* It will contain lists of all the French agents, major and minor with biographical notes, etc., and a history of all their negotiations in Switzerland.

The life of Calvin by M. Doumergue, professor of church history in the Faculty of Protestant Theology at Montauban (*Jean Calvin, les Hommes et les Choses de son Temps*), is to be a monument of the first importance to the memory of the reformer. The first volume, *La Jeunesse de Calvin* (Lausanne, Bridel), has appeared. It contains 157 reproductions of old engravings, autographs, etc., and 113 plates from original drawings by M. Armand Delille

A year ago the Protestant churches of France celebrated the three-hundredth anniversary of the Edict of Nantes. The papers read on that occasion have been gathered into a volume by the publishing house of Berger-Levrault. It is handsomely and interestingly illustrated, and contains essays of high value; for instance, on the methods by which the Edict was violated almost as soon as it was issued, on Protestant teaching under the Edict, on Saumur as the intellectual capital of the Huguenots, etc.

M. Lacour-Gayet's *L'Éducation Politique de Louis XIV.* (Paris, Hachette), deals first with the details of the instruction directly bestowed on the young king, a matter which is treated with thorough and original research, and secondly analyzes the political theories of the time, especially those relating to the monarchy, in the effort to show what principles of government must have been imbibed by a prince placed in the environment in which Louis found himself. The book is intended to pave the way toward one on the political ideas of the king.

In the *Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History* (University of Pennsylvania) the latest document printed is the *Protest of the Cour des Aides of Paris*, April 10, 1775, reprinted from the Cornell University copy of the pamphlet *Remontrances*, edited by Professor J. H. Robinson, and provided with a translation.

Of publications in the official series devoted to the French Revolution, we have to note two in that issued by the Ministry of Public Instruction: Vol. II. of M. Brette's *Recueil de Documents relatifs à la Convocation des États Généraux de 1789*, and Vol. II. of M. E. Charavay's *Correspondance de Carnot*. The latter, extending from August to October, 1793, contains for that period practically the whole military correspondence of the Committee of Public Safety. In the series published under the auspices of the municipal council of Paris we have Vol. II. of Dr. Robinet's *Mouvement Religieux à Paris pendant la Révolution*, and the first volume of a documentary series on *Les Volontaires Nationaux pendant la Révolution*, edited by MM. C. L. Chassin and L. Hennet. This gives the military history and the muster-rolls of the first eight Parisian battalions of 1791 and 1792.

M. Sagnac, *La Législation Civile de la Révolution* (Paris, Hachette) discusses with great thoroughness the work of legal reform undertaken by the lawyers and statesmen of the Revolution, and the extent to which the civil portions of the Code Napoleon should be attributed to them. The legislation of the leaders of the Revolution with respect to charity, and the results of their activity in this field, especially of the changes which they effected in the ancient charitable institutions of France, are set forth with great ability by M. L. Lallemand in his *La Révolution et les Pauvres* (Paris, Picard, pp. 398).

Toulon et les Anglais en 1793, by M. Paul Cottin (Paris, Ollendorff, pp. 455), is a monograph of great merit, worked out from very complete studies not only in the printed and manuscript materials of France, but in the manuscripts of the Public Record Office in London.

In commemoration of the battle of Marengo, the historical society of the province of Alessandria is organizing an international Congress of

Napoleonic History to be held at Alessandria in June, 1900. Baron Alberto Lumbroso will be the actual president of the congress. It is expected that the scientific papers read will be printed in commemoration; it is possible that an exhibition of Napoleonic autographs, coins, relics, etc., will be organized.

The most notable Napoleonic memoir of the year 1899, thus far, is the *Journal Inédit du Général Baron Gourgaud, Sainte-Hélène, de 1815 à 1818*, published, with prefaces and notes, by the Vicomte de Grouchy and M. Antoine Guillois (Paris, Flammarion, Vol. I., pp. 590). This first volume extends to May, 1817. Apparently the most notable recent book of military history of Napoleon is Yorck von Wartenburg's *Napoléon Chef d'Armée* (Paris, L. Baudoin, two volumes) published in 1898, but seemingly written in 1884.

M. Albert Babeau, who in 1884 published an interesting book on English travelers in France from the Renaissance to the Revolution, has lately brought out a translation of the remarkable account of his travels in France in 1802 written by Sir John Carr, and has prefixed to it an interesting introduction on the English travelers who flocked to France in such great numbers after the conclusion of the peace of Amiens.

Two acute, amusing and instructive volumes on the Empress Josephine, *Joséphine de Beauharnais* and *Joséphine Impératrice et Reine* (Paris, Ollendorff), continue M. Frédéric Masson's series of graphic portrayals of the women of the family of Bonaparte.

Mr. Hereford B. George, author of *Battles of English History*, will shortly publish (Fisher Unwin) an important work on Napoleon's Russian campaign.

M. Houssaye has brought out the second volume of his masterly narrative entitled *1815* (Paris, Perrin) containing his account of the Waterloo campaign.

For some months past M. Ernest Daudet has been publishing in the various French reviews a number of articles relating to the life and especially the political career of the Duc Decazes. They have been based on the papers of Decazes, which embrace an exceptionally full and intimate correspondence with Louis XVIII. M. Daudet has now published an interesting volume called *Louis XVIII. et le Duc Decazes, 1815–1820.*

F. A. Perthes of Gotha has ready an index of 68 pages to Karl Hillebrand's *Geschichte Frankreichs während des Julikönigthums*, in the Heeren and Ukert series.

The third volume of M. Émile Ollivier's *L'Empire Libéral* (Paris, Garnier) is devoted to the internal and external history of the Second Empire from 1852 to 1859, and to an interesting critique of Napoleon's policy by the ex-premier, in which he ascribes most of the later misfortunes to the original error of setting up the Empire instead of maintaining the Republic.

M. Pierre Lehautcourt has published the third volume of his admirable *Siège de Paris* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, pp. 468), covering the history of the final efforts of the defenders, and that of the capitulation.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Abbé Vacandard, *L'Idolatrie en Gaule au VI^e et au VII^e Siècle* (Revue des Questions Historiques, April); Abbé P. Feret, *L'Université de Paris et les Jésuites dans la seconde Moitié du XVI^e Siècle* (Revue des Questions Historiques, April); B. B. Warfield, *The Literary History of Calvin's Institutes* (Presbyterian and Reformed Review, April); E. Garnault, *Les Bourgeois Rochelais des Temps Passés et les Causes de la Décadence du Commerce de la Rochelle au XVIII^e Siècle* (Revue Historique, May); Comte d'Haussonville, *La Duchesse de Bourgogne à la Cour*, I., II. (Revue des Deux Mondes, March 1, April 1); Vicomte de Boislecomte, *Le Maréchal de Belleisle pendant la Guerre de la Succession d'Autriche* (Revue des Questions Historiques, January); H. Glagau, *General Lafayette und der Sturz der Monarchie in Frankreich*, II. (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXII. 3); A. Pingaud, *Le Congrès de Vienne et la Politique de Talleyrand* (Revue Historique, May); G. Rothan, *Napoléon III. et l'Italie*, II., III. (Revue des Deux Mondes, February 15, March 15).

ITALY, SPAIN, PORTUGAL.

In Heyck's series of *Monographien zur Weltgeschichte* Professor Hans von Zwiedineck-Südenhorst brings out a well-illustrated essay of 208 pages on *Venedig als Weltmacht und Weltstaat* (Bielefeld, Velhagen and Klasing).

In Vol. II., No. 2, of the Prussian Institute's *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, the chief matter is a correspondence between Gasparo Contarini and Ercole Gonzaga; Dr. Schellhass continues his documents on Ninguarda's nunciature in Bavaria and Austria, 1572–1577.

Professor Baldassare Labanca of the University of Rome has made an interesting and valuable contribution to the history of the philosophy of history in Italy, by a learned and acute work entitled *Giambattista Vico e i suoi Critici Cattolici, con Osservacioni Comparative sugli Studi Religiosi dei Secoli XVIII e XIX* (Naples, pp. 452). Catholic defenders of Vico are treated to some extent, as well as his opponents.

In the *Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria* (XXI. 3–4) the leading matter is a collection of studies on the pontificate of Clement XI., by F. Pometti.

In the *Archivio Storico Italiano* Professor G. Rondoni has published, with an interesting essay, extracts from the correspondence of G. P. Vieusseux, 1820 to 1860. Vieusseux was a friend of so many of the Italian scholars and patriots of that time that his correspondence casts important light on the period of the Risorgimento.

Signor Raffaello Giovagnoli, a profound student of the Italian events of 1848–1849, has published the first volume of a work called *Pellegrino*

Rossi e la Rivoluzione Romana con Documenti Nuovi (Rome, Forzani), in which, after elaborate studies, he treats of Rossi's life, his ministry under Pius IX., and his death. The second volume will be occupied with the investigation which followed, with the evidence which it presented as to the revolutionary movement, and with the documents.

In April, Brescia celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of its ten days' resistance to the Austrians in 1849. For the occasion the *Sentinella Bresciana* issued a folio souvenir brochure containing much historical matter and reminiscence, and many illustrations.

Giacomo Dina e l' Opera Sua nelle Vicende del Risorgimento Italiano is a work which furnishes much secondary information on recent Italian history. Dina was a journalist of great ability; but what gives special importance to him and his writings is the fact that he was, during Cavour's ministry, the mouthpiece of Cavour, and after Cavour's death he represented in *L' Opinione* the principles of the Moderate Liberals. Senator Luigi Chiala, the veteran historical editor, has charge of the work, two volumes of which have been published (Turin: Roux, Frassati and Co.).

In the *Revista Critica de Historia y Literatura* for June–September, 1898, Señor Arturo Farinelli of Gratz and Innsbruck presents a body of supplementary notes to his former collection on foreign travellers in Spain and Portugal, with some interesting extracts from unpublished narratives and letters. In the same number Mr. Adolph Hillman treats of the historical relations between Spain and Sweden.

Señor J. Suárez Inclán has published a historical work in two volumes entitled *Guerra de Anexión en Portugal durante el Reinado de D. Felipe II.* (Madrid, pp. 435, 432).

Captain Cesaréo Fernandez Duro has brought out the fourth volume of his classic history of the Spanish navy, *Armada Española desde la Unión de Castilla y de Leon,* of which the first volume was noticed in this review (II. 344).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND.

The historic-economic section of the Fürstlich Jablonowski'sche Gesellschaft offers for 1902 a prize of a thousand marks for a monograph on the development, in Germany, of writing upon the history of civilization, from Herder to Freytag, Riehl and Burckhardt inclusive. The conditions for the contest are those which have been usual with the society.

Vol. XLIV. of the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* extends from Wolfenbüttel to Zeis, and it must be presumed that another volume will alphabetically complete this great enterprise.

Three more source-books call for the attention of the teacher of history: *Ausgewählte Urkunden zur deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte,* edited by G. von Below and F. Keutgen (Weimar, E. Felber, Vol. I.);

Urkunden zur städtischen Verfassungsgeschichte, edited by F. Keutgen (Felber); and *Quellen zur Geschichte der Revolutionszeit*, edited by H. Huffer (Leipzig, B. G. Teubner).

The Berlin Historical Society has published the volume for 1897 (Jahrg. XX.), of its *Jahresberichte der Geschichtswissenschaft* (pp. 107, 461, 448, 346).

Professor K. T. von Inama-Sternegg of Vienna continues his important work by the issue of a first volume of his *Deutsche Wirthschaftsgeschichte in den letzten Jahrhunderten des Mittelalters* (Leipzig, Duncker and Humblot).

Dr. Moritz Stern, in a thorough monograph, accompanied by many documentary texts, *König Ruprecht von der Pfalz in seinen Beziehungen zu den Juden* (Kiel), contests the usual view that the Jews enjoyed their best days in Germany under Rupert.

The Verein für Hansische Geschichte has issued the sixth volume (1477-1530) of the third section of the *Hanserecesse*, ed. Dietrich Schäfer; and the first volume (pp. 501) of a new series of its *Hansische Geschichtsquellen*, a volume by Dr. Franz Siewert on the history and documents of the Riga trade of Lübeck in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The *Geschichtsblätter des deutschen Hugenotten-Vereins*, VIII. 1-6, contain accounts of Huguenot, Walloon or Waldensian communities at Hanau, Lüneburg, Serres in Württemberg, Neu-Kelsterbach, and Schwabendorf.

M. Rod. Reuss has completed his important work on *L'Alsace au XVII^e^ Siècle* (Paris, Bouillon), formerly mentioned in these pages, by a second volume in which he deals, in a similarly admirable manner, with the history of Alsatian society, letters and religion.

Professor Munroe Smith has printed in an attractive little volume, *Bismarck and German Unity, a Historical Outline* (Macmillan, pp. 99), his admirable summary aricle, originally published in the New York *Evening Post*, immediately after Prince Bismarck's death. The author has made a few additions to the first sketch, and has prefixed to the volume an interesting mezzotint portrait. Among the recent German addresses on Bismarck those most worthy of mention appear to be those of Lenz (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, January); of Marcks (Leipzig address and paper on Bismarck and the Hohenzollerns in *Hohenzollern-Jahrbuch*, Vol. II.); of Schmoller (*Forschungen zur Brandenburgischen und Preussischen Geschichte*, XII. 1); of Bezold (*Bonner Zeitung*), and of Kauffmann (*Nord und Süd*, No. 262). The first three of these have been printed in a volume, *Zu Bismarck's Gedächtnis* (Leipzig, Duncker and Humblot, pp. 174).

The Verein für Geschichte der Mark Brandenburg, aided by the estates of the province and by the Prussian archives, intends to publish the earlier acts of the estates, inventories of the minor archives, an agrarian map and other works in the historical geography of the province.

The Historical Commission of the kingdom of Württemberg has begun the publication of the *Briefwechsel des Herzogs Christoph von Wirtemberg*, edited by Dr. Viktor Ernst (Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer). The first volume (pp. 900) covers the years 1550–1552.

The constitutional history of one of the smallest, but not one of the least interesting of the German states, during an important period, is the theme of Dr. F. Bruns's *Verfassungsgeschichte des Lübeckischen Freistaats 1848–1898* (Lübeck, Borchers, pp. 185).

In the series of *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Wien*, Professor Karl Uhlirz, archivist of the municipality, presents a volume of *Verzeichniss der Originalurkunden des städtischen Archives*, 1239–1411 (Vienna, Tempsky, pp. 626).

The latest number of the *Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de Genève* (II. 2) is almost wholly given up to an address commemorative of the late Pierre Vaucher, and to a bibliography of his works and of the notices of him which have appeared since his death.

From 1521 to 1656, and nominally until 1798 the canton of Zürich maintained in its "Volksfragen" an institution analogous to the modern referendum. In the *Jahrbuch für Schweizerische Geschichte*, XXIII., Professor Karl Dändliker presents in detail the history of this institution. For illustration of the popular aspects of the Reformation movement the local replies are of considerable value and interest.

Professor Wilhelm Oechsli of Zürich has published an interesting "centennial" study of Switzerland in 1798 and 1799 under the title *Vor Hundert Jahren* (Zürich, Schulthess, pp. 188) with a map.

In an inaugural discourse delivered at Basel, and which should be of some interest to American readers, *Die Gründung des schweizerischen Bundesstaates im Jahre 1848* (Basel, Schwabe), Professor F. Fleiner studies the manner in which the constitution framed in that year grew out of the arrangements of 1815.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Brunner, *Der Totentheil der germanischen Rechte* (Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Germ. Abth., 19); K. Hampe, *Kaiser Friedrich II.* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXIII. 1); H. Oncken, *Sebastian Franck als Historiker* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXII. 3); P. Zinck, *Studentisches Leben in Leipzig zur Zeit des Kurfürsten August*, 1553–1586 (Zeitschrift für Kulturgeschichte, VI. 4–5); F. Stieve, *Wallenstein's Leben von 1609 bis 1623* (Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in München, phil.-hist. Cl., 1898, II. 2); F. Stieve, *Wallenstein bis zur Übernahme des ersten Generalats* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, II. 2); *R. Koser, Friedrich Wilhelm IV. am Vorabend der Märzrevolution* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXIII. 1); P. de la Gorce, *La Prusse avant Sadowa* (Le Correspondant, February 10).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM.

A new Belgian historical journal, entitled *Archives Belges*, began to appear at the beginning of the present year, under the editorial conduct of Professor Godefroid Kurth, of the University of Liège. It will contain no body-articles, the contents being limited to reviews of books, notices of periodicals, and news.

The Dutch government has published the reports of Mr. Busken Huet and Mr. van Vleen on their historical researches in the archives of Paris, those of the former relating to the times of William the Silent and Leicester, those of the latter to Duke Charles of Gelderland and the Egmond family.

Professor Henri Lonchay of Brussels has brought out a scholarly edition of the *Comentario de la Guerra de Frisia* of Colonel Francisco Verdugo, an important Spanish officer who commanded in the northern Netherlands from 1581 to 1594, and whose memoirs, long forgotten, rare, and absorbed by writers of a little later time, are of great importance for events and for their picture of the Spanish army. M. Lonchay has added to the book many letters of Verdugo, especially to his father-in-law Mansfeldt, governor-general *ad interim*.

The Historical Society of Utrecht has published the *Diarium Everardi Bronchorstii, sive Adversaria omnium quae gesta sunt in Academia Leydensi*, 1591–1627, edited by Mr. van Slee, a curious record of professorial life and academic doings.

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE.

Mr. Norstedt, of Stockholm, has published the ninth volume of *Axel Oxenstiernas Skrifter och Brefvexling*.

Dr. O. S. Rydberg has published the eleventh volume (1846–1867) of *Sveriges og Norges Traktater med främmande Magder jemte andra dit hörande Handlingar* (pp. 775).

It may be convenient for students who do not read Russian to know that the main results of Miliukov's great work on the history of Russian civilization are summarized by Boris Minzès in an article entitled "Skizzen zur Geschichte des Wirthschaftsstaats und der Gesellschaft in Russland" in Wolf's *Zeitschrift für Sozialwissenschaft*, 1898, 10, 11. But it also appears that a German translation of Miliukov *in extenso*, by E. Davidson, *Skizzen russischer Kulturgeschichte*, is being brought out at Leipzig.

La Question d' Orient depuis ses Origines jusqu'à nos Jours, by E. Driault (Paris, Alcan, pp. 407), conceives of the Eastern Question broadly, narrates its history with learning and good judgment, is exceedingly well written, and is accompanied with excellent bibliographies.

Mr. Leo Wiener, instructor in the Slavic languages at Harvard University, has written *The History of Yiddish Literature in the Nineteenth Century* (Scribner, pp. 402).

A most interesting aspect of the history of civilization in Rumania is treated by Mr. Pompiliu Eliade, a young Rumanian scholar, formerly a pupil of the École Normale Supérieure at Paris, in a valuable dissertation on *L' Influence Française sur l'Esprit Public en Roumanie à l'Époque des Règnes Phanariotes* (1711–1821).

AMERICA.

Mr. Jeremiah Curtin has gathered the fruits of extensive travel, inquiry and study in the realm of Indian folklore into his volume entitled *Creation Myths of primitive America in relation to the Religious History and Mental Development of Mankind* (Boston, Little, Brown and Co.).

We note the appearance of the second volume of Mr. E. J. Payne's *History of the New World called America*; and of the second volume of Mr. J. C. Ropes's *The Story of the Civil War*, dealing with the campaign of 1862.

The Government Printing Office has published a useful work entitled *Parliamentary Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States* (pp. 1171). These precedents have been collected from the journals and records of debates, and arranged with suitable references to the Constitution and those statutes which relate to the organization and administration of the House. The work was compiled by Mr. Asher C. Hinds, clerk at the Speaker's table, and is published by authority of Congress.

The fourth volume of Mr. J. F. Rhodes's *History of the United States* and the fifth volume (1821–1837) of Professor McMaster's *History of the People of the United States* are expected to be published in the autumn.

Messrs. D. Appleton and Co. announce *A History of the American Nation*, by Professor A. C. McLaughlin, of the University of Michigan.

In the *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society* for October 21, 1898, Dr. E. E. Hale gives an account of the late Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull's dictionary of the Massachusetts Indian language; Dr. G. Stanley Hall gives a curious study of initiations into adolescence, including the phenomena of conversion, while Mr. Andrew McFarland Davis discusses the plates for the Massachusetts currency of 1689–1750.

In an interesting and learned article reprinted from *Globus*, *Die Behandlung weiblicher Gefangener durch die Indianer von Nordamerika*, Lieutenant Friederici of the German army labors, and apparently with success, to show that the present horrible and, it appears, invariable custom is wholly of modern origin.

Mr. C. L. Traver, of 108 South Broad Street, Trenton, N. J., has printed, in a limited edition of 290 copies, the *Journal, or Historical Recollections of American Events during the Revolutionary War*, of Elias Boudinot, President of the Continental Congress.

The diary of Colonel Israel Angell, of the Continental Line, has lately been brought to light, and its six scattered parts reunited. It covers the period from August 30, 1778, to April 3, 1781, and is of especial interest for the battle of Rhode Island and for events connected with West Point and with the treason of Benedict Arnold. The Preston and Rounds Co., of Providence, propose to issue this diary in a limited edition, with notes by Mr. Edward Field.

The later period of anti-slavery agitation, and the subsequent work for the freedmen, are illustrated by Rev. John W. Chadwick's edition of the letters of Sallie Holley, published by Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons, under the title *A Life for Liberty*.

It is expected that the series of the *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies* will be completed in about a year more.

The *Report and Accompanying Papers* of the Venezuela-Guiana Boundary Commission is reviewed at some length by M. L. Gallois in the *Revue Historique* for May, and by M. Henri Froidevaux in the *Revue des Questions Historiques* for April.

The Woolfall Company, N. Y., announce *The Life of Admiral George Dewey, U. S. N., from Montpelier to Manila*. The author is a member of the Dewey family, and has had the assistance of the Admiral's immediate family, at Montpelier. Much material has been obtained from the personal correspondence of Admiral Dewey.

The Colonial Society of Massachusetts has printed, and has issued to its members, a part of the fifth volume of its *Publications*, embracing the transactions of November and December, 1897. The principal paper, and one of much interest, is one by Mr. John Noble, clerk of the Supreme Judicial Court, on "The Records and Files of the Superiour Court of Judicature, and of the Supreme Judicial Court, their History and Places of Deposit." The second volume (Vol. I. of the Society's *Collections*), is to contain the texts of all the commissions and instructions issued to governors of Massachusetts while it was a royal province; this volume is now nearly completed.

The Macmillan Company have in press *Old Cambridge*, by Col. Thomas Wentworth Higginson, the first volume of a series of *National Studies in American Letters*, designed to present the history and development of our literature during its first century with especial reference to historical movements, social conditions, and the local differences of origin, temperament and environment.

The New York Public Library has recently acquired a portion of those papers of President Monroe which were not bought in 1849 by the Federal Government, but remained in the possession of the descendants of Col. Monroe.

The Smith of Nibley papers are continued in the *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library for April and May; the April number concludes the calendar of Dr. Emmet's collection of manuscripts, etc., relating to the Signers of the Declaration of Independence; it is expected that the

July number will contain the text of several unpublished letters of John C. Calhoun to James Monroe.

Mr. Harold Scudder, of 32 Liberty Street, New York, offers for sale a very small edition of the *Records of the First Church in Huntington, Long Island*, 1723–1779. The record is one kept by Rev. Ebenezer Prime, pastor during the years mentioned, and includes lists of members, baptisms and marriages, accounts of trials of members, etc.

The April number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History* is one of much interest. Mr. John W. Jordan contributes an article describing Franklin's journeys and correspondence in quest of information respecting his relatives and descent in England; also, some hospital returns of the Revolutionary War, showing the employment of women as nurses. Mr. C. H. Lincoln has a careful and suggestive article on Representation in the Pennsylvania Assembly prior to the Revolution. The journal prints a first installment of an abstract of the general title of the Penn family to their estates in Pennsylvania, drawn up some thirty years ago by their counsel, the late Hon. John Cadwalader; and a description of the capture of Fort Washington, New York, derived from the diary of Captain Andreas Wiederhold of the Hessian Regiment "Knyphausen."

The American Baptist Publication Society has just issued *The First Baptist Church, Philadelphia: Its History and the Bi-centennial Celebration of Its Foundation*, an illustrated volume of 500 pages, with documentary appendixes. The historical portion of the book is mostly written by Dr. W. W. Keen.

The April number of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* contains an unusually rich variety of original documents. Among those of most interest we note: the beginning of a series of reminiscences of Western Virginia, 1770–1830, by one John Redd, apparently elicited by Dr. Lyman C. Draper; the will of Mrs. Mary Willing Byrd, 1813, valuable especially for its indications as to the portraits then preserved at Westover; a collection of Mr. Sainsbury's abstracts, ranging from 1618 to 1624; and documents relating to Governor Spotswood's German settlers, a Virginian Jacobite of 1690, and the treatment in Virginia of the Acadian exiles of 1755.

In a well-illustrated little pamphlet entitled *The Making of the Union —Contribution of the College of William and Mary, in Virginia*, President Lyon G. Tyler presents the salient facts concerning the public services of that famous institution, together with tabular statements which, by lists of official names, show the eminent positions attained by its graduates in the Federal service and that of Virginia.

The *Lower Norfolk County Virginia Antiquary*, No. 2, Part 4, contains, beside the usual data interesting to genealogists, a collection of documents relating to the Church in Norfolk County, 1651–1653, and a continuation of Mrs. Maxwell's interesting reminiscences of Norfolk in the time of Lord Dunmore's raid and the battle of Great Bridge. An index to the second volume may now be had.

Mr. Charles L. Coon, of Charlotte, N. C., expects before the end of the present year to publish a *History of Mecklenburg County, North Carolina*, based on the original sources.

Col. John P. Thomas, state historian of South Carolina, charged with the collection and custody of its military records of the period of the Confederacy, has succeeded in collecting "all the Confederate rolls proper—infantry, cavalry and artillery, including the field and staff of regiments and battalions," and the "rolls of eighty companies of state troops" and other organizations—598 rolls in all, embracing 67,000 officers and men.

Mr. Charles H. Coe, who has long resided in Florida, has made a thorough study, from original sources, printed and manuscript, of the history of the Seminoles and of the war which the United States waged against them, and has embodied the results in a volume entitled *Red Patriots: The Story of the Seminoles* (Cincinnati, Editor Publishing Co., pp. 290), illustrated with pictures taken from those of Catlin.

The Mississippi Historical Society began in 1898 the issue of a series of *Publications*, chiefly under the charge of Professor Franklin L. Riley, of the University of Mississippi, where a branch of the society has been established.

The Filson Club's fourteenth volume consists of an account of Henry Clay's mother, by Hon. Zachary F. Smith, and a genealogy of the Clay family, by Mrs. Mary Rogers Clay.

The *American Historical Magazine*, of Nashville, has completed the publication by installments of the first volume of the Correspondence of General James Robertson. This volume contains 182 documents, and extends from 1784 to 1795. The second volume will proceed to the death of General Robertson in 1814. Its installments have already begun to be printed in the *Magazine*.

The April number of the *Publications of the Southern History Association* contains a readable article by Mr. Lester G. Bugbee, of the University of Texas, on "Some Difficulties of a Texas Empresario" (Stephen F. Austin, 1821–1828); and a petition which General Thomas J. Green, of the Republic of Texas, addressed in 1843 to President Tyler from the castle of Perote, Mexico, in which he was confined after his failure in the Mier expedition.

In the April *Annals of Iowa* the principal article is one on the history of the State University by Dr. J. L. Pickard, formerly its president.

The latest historical bulletin of the University of Oregon contains a survey of northwestward exploration by Professor F. G. Young, and a brief review of the régime of the Hudson's Bay Company in Oregon, by Mrs. Eva E. Dye.

In the *Colección de Documentos Inéditos relativos á las Antiguas Posesiones Españolas de Ultramar*, the Royal Academy of History at

Madrid has made a beginning of a series of *Relaciones de Yucatan* (Madrid, Sucesores de Rivadeneyra, Vol. I., pp. 436).

Señor V. Llorens has issued at Seville (Rodríguez and López) the first *livraison* of a *Historia General de Filipinas y Catálogo de los Documentos referentes á estas Islas qui se conservan en el Archivo General de Indias.*

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. Strong, *A Forgotten Danger to the New England Colonies* (New England Magazine, April); P. L. Ford, *Benjamin Franklin as Printer and Publisher* (Century, April); W. G. Brown, *William Lowndes Yancey, the Orator of Secession* (Atlantic Monthly, May); W. T. Sampson, *The Atlantic Fleet in the Spanish War* (Century, April); Evans, Taylor, Wainwright, Philip, Cook, Chadwick and others, *The Naval Battle of Santiago* (Century, May).

INDEX

AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOL. IV

☞ *The names of contributors are printed in small capitals*

Abasolo, 636.
Acadia, 5; attack on, 229.
Achelis, Hans, and G. Nath. Bonwetsch, *Hippolytus Werke*, I., by F. A. CHRISTIE (Review), 511.
Achinese, Dutch wars against the, 263.
Adams, C. F., 317.
Adams, Charles K., 11.
Adams, George B., 420.
Adams, Henry, 11, 13, 62.
Adams, Herbert B., 410.
Adams, John, 4, 292–312, 330; prospects of, in 1800, 112, 113.
Adams, John, The Politics of, by ANSON D. MORSE, 292.
Adams, John Quincy, 88, 657.
Adams, *Life and Writings of*, 113.
Adams, Samuel, 292, 298, 307.
Administrative History, The, of the British Dependencies in the Further East, by H. MORSE STEPHENS, 246.
Æschines, Orations of, 637.
Africa, 56, 426.
Agenais, the Reformation in, 226.
Agreda, María de, 638.
Aitzema, 472.
Aldama, 636.
Alençon, tracts printed at, 219.
Alexander, Gen., 673, 675.
Algiers, 449.
Alla Ricerca della Via Caecilia, by N. Persichetti, by ALBERT G. HARKNESS (Review), 584.
Alleghanies, the, 62, 66, 70, 623, 635.
Allende, 636.
ALLINSON, F. G., *A Concise Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, by F. Warre Cornish (Review), 385.
Allison, John, 318.
Alsace, 24, 34.
Alton (Ill.), 315.
Alvarez, Sanchez, 644.
Amazon, the, 473.
Amboyna, massacre at, 247.
America, 63, 68, 72, 75, 76, 299–301, 311; the discovery of, 38, 47, 231; doctrine of natural rights in, 293; history of, 1–3.
America, The First Republic in, by Alexander Brown, by WM. WIRT HENRY (Review), 162.
America, The Historical Opportunity in, by ALBERT B. HART, 1.
America, Spanish, 446, 447, 451–454.
American Academy of Political and Social Science, Annals of the, 17.
American Constitutional Law, Cases on, edited by Carl E. Boyd, by ROGER FOSTER (Review), 189.
American Economic Association, 413.
American Historical Association, the, 10, 11, 18–20; *Annual Report* of the, 12, 20, 421, 761; Constitution of, 420; officers and committees of the, 421, 422.
American Historical Association, Annual Report for 1897 (Review), 761.
American Historical Association, The New Haven Meeting of the, 409.
American Historical Review, 17, 20, 409, 410.
American History told by Contemporaries, II, edited by Albert B. Hart (Review), 168.
American Loyalists, 420.
American Oratory, Modern, by Ralph C. Ringwalt (Review), 392.

American People, the Constitutional History of the, by Francis N. Thorpe, by ANSON D. MORSE (Review), 734.
American Politics, The Rise and Growth of, by Henry J. Ford, by JOHN W. PERRIN (Review), 592.
American Revolution, the, 449; in Connecticut, 276.
American Revolution, The, (Lecky), edited by James A. Woodburn (Review), 762.
Ames, Herman V., *The Proposed Amendments of the Constitution of the United States during the First Century of its History*, by ROGER FOSTER (Review), 177.
Amherst College, 418.
Amherst, Lord, 258.
Amiens, the peace of, 441, 442, 449; the Reformation at, 223.
Amsterdam Chamber, papers of the, 474.
Analecta Bollandiana (Reviews) 182, 585.
Ancestry of John Whitney, The, by Henry Melville, by MELVILLE M. BIGELOW (Review), 193.
Anderson, John, 283, 284, 457, 459.
Anderson, Robert, 120, 330.
Andrews, Charles M., 416, 417; *The Historical Development of Modern Europe*, II., by CHARLES H. LEVERMORE (Review), 357.
ANDREWS, CHARLES M., *Geschichte Europas seit den Verträgen von* 1815 *bis zum Frankfurter Frieden von* 1871, von Alfred Stern, II (Review), 153; *The Life of Napoleon III*, by Archibald Forbes (Review), 360.
ANDREWS, E. BENJ., *War Memories of an Army Chaplain*, by H. Clay Trumbull (Review), 748.
Angoulême, Marguerite d', 225.
Annals, The, of the Voyages of the Brothers Nicolo and Antonio Zeno, by Fred. W. Lucas, by B. F. DECOSTA (Review), 726.
Anneville, heretics at, 225.
Anselme, Father, 60.
Anson, Sir Wm. R. (editor), *Autobiography and Political Correspondence of Augustus Henry, Third Duke of Grafton*, by JAMES A. WOODBURN (Review), 715.
Anspach, *History of Newfoundland* by, 54.
Antilles, the, 39, 443–445, 448.
Anti-Nebraska Democrats, 313.
Aragon, 49; French troops in, 73.
Aranda, 69.
Aranjuez, 74; the revolution of, 451; the treaty of, 471.
Arbitrations, International, to which the United States has been a Party, History and Digest of, by John B. Moore, by E. I. RENICK (Review), 563.
Archives, the National, 7, 8; of the states, 7.
Argentine, the, 449, 450.
Armistead, Gen., 676.
Arnold, Benedict, 129; before Quebec, 129, 131.
"Articles and Orders," the, of the Council for New England, 686–690.
Artois, Comte d', 37.
Arvert, Protestants in, 225.
Ashbourne, Lord, *Pitt: Some Chapters of his Life and Times*, by GOLDWIN SMITH (Review), 527.
ASHLEY, W. J., *France*, by John E. C. Bodley (Review), 353.
Ashton Court, 690.
Asia, 56; trade of, with Europe, 247.
"Association of Loyalists," 279.
Assyria, Babylonia and, The Religion of, by Morris Jastrow, by JOHN P. PETERS (Review), 502.
Aston, John, 424, 426, 428, 429, 438.
Astrakhan, 441.
Atchison, Senator, 89.
Attempts toward Colonization: the Council for New England and the Merchant Venturers of Bristol, 1621–1623, by MILLER CHRISTY, 678.
Aubusson, 222.
Augustinians, order of the, 426.
Aumale, heretics at, 225.
Aurora, 16.
Austria, 36; and the American mines, 235.
Autobiography and Political Correspondence of Augustus Henry, Third Duke of Grafton, edited by Sir Wm. R. Anson, by JAMES A. WOODBURN (Review), 715.
Autobiography of a Veteran, The, by Gen. della Rocca (Review), 589.
Auvergne, 226; the Reformation in, 227.
Ave Roma Immortalis, by F. Marion Crawford, by A. L. FROTHINGHAM, JR. (Review), 508.
Ayala, Don Pedro de, 60, 682.
Ayscue, 236.
Babylonia and Assyria, The Religion of, by Morris Jastrow, by JOHN P. PETERS (Review), 502.

Baccalaos, 48, 52.
Baden, 35, 36.
Bahamas, the, 63, 242.
Bailey, W. S., 317, 318.
BAIN, JAMES, JR., editor of *Journal of the most remarkable Occurrences in Quebec, 1775* (Document), 129–132.
Baird, Henry M., 218.
Bajan, 643.
Baker, Marcus, 475.
Baldwin City, 95, 102.
Baldwin, Hon. Robert, 478.
BALDWIN, SIMEON E., *John Adams, the Statesman of the American Revolution*, by Mellen Chamberlain (Review), 367.
Baldwin, Simeon E., 419; his *Modern Political Institutions*, by JEREMIAH W. JENKS (Review), 582.
Baldwin, William W., 478.
Baltimore, 102, 103, 126, 127, 660, 667–669, 671.
Baltimore Committee of Safety, Minutes of, 420.
BANCROFT, FREDERIC, *Life and Public Services of Edwin M. Stanton*, by George C. Gorham (Review), 745.
Bancroft, George, 13.
Banks, N. P., Speaker, 319.
Bantam, English factory at, 247, 248.
Baptists of the Middle States, A History of the, by Henry C. Vedder, by WM. H. WHITSITT (Review), 553.
Barbadoes, 236.
Barbeau, Jean Bte., 628.
Barnburners, the, 314.
Barnsfare, Capt., 131.
Barnstable (Mass.), documents found at, 9.
Barnstaple, the committee of, 686.
Barreda, Fray Domingo, 650.
Barrington, Rhode Island, History of, by Thomas W. Bicknell (Review), 198.
Barrois, 26, 30.
Bastile, the, 70; site of the, 5.
Batavia, 248, 256, 259.
Battle of Gettysburg, The, by JAMES F. RHODES, 665.
Battles of Trenton and Princeton, The, by William S. Stryker, by HENRY C. CAMERON (Review), 731.
Bauld, Cape, 40.
Bayard *vs.* Singleton, 465.
Bayonne, 447, 452, 453.
Bazancourt, 26.
Beach, Rev. John, 273.
Beardsley, Dr. Eben, 277, 278.
Béarn, the Reformation in, 226.
Beauvais, the church of, 223.
Beazley, C. Raymond, *John and Sebastian Cabot; The Discovery of North America*, by GEORGE P. WINSHIP (Review), 159.
Becket, John, 431.
Bedeman, Lawrence, 428, 429.
Beginnings of Protestant Worship, The (paper), 417.
BELKNAP, GEO. E., *Memories of a Rear-Admiral*, by S. R. Franklin (Review), 378.
Belknap, the *History of New Hampshire*, by, 16.
Bellefontaine, 632.
Belliard, 440.
Bell, John, of Tennessee, by JOSHUA W. CALDWELL, 652.
Bell, Samuel, 654.
Beman, J. C., 318.
Bencoolen, English factory at, 248–250, 252–254.
Bengal, Bay of, 249; English victory in, 248; government of, 255, 258; Mutiny of 1857, 262; trade with, 247.
Bentinck, Lord William, 254.
Beresford, 449, 450.
Berkeley, Governor, 4.
Berquin, Louis de, 218.
Berry, G. G., translator of *Introduction to the Study of History*, by Langlois and Seignobos, by E. C. B. (Review), 383.
Berry in France, 58.
Berthier, Marshal, 443.
Beyond the Mississippi, by Richardson, 94.
Bible, translations of the, 425, 430, 431.
Bicknell, Thomas W., *History of Barrington, Rhode Island* (Review), 198.
Biddle, 55.
BIGELOW, MELVILLE M., *The Ancestry of John Whitney*, by Henry Melville (Review), 193.
Big Springs, convention at, 93.
Bingham, Kingsley S., 317.
Bismarck, the Man and the Statesman, by Prince von Bismarck, by MUNROE SMITH (Review), 536.
Bismarck, Otto Fürst von, *Gedanken und Erinnerungen*, by MUNROE SMITH (Review), 536.
Bismarck: Some Secret Pages of his History, by Dr. Moritz Busch, by CHARLES H. LEVERMORE (Review), 531.

Biville, in Normandy, 27.

BLACKMAR, FRANK W., *De Soto and His Men in the Land of Florida*, by Grace King (Review), 541.

Blaine, Col. Ephraim, 420.

Blaine, James G., 662.

Blair, Emma, *Annotated Catalogue of Newspaper Files* (Review), 593.

Blair, Francis P., 317–319.

Blair, F. P., Jr., 320.

Blasingame, Capt., 330.

Blasingame, John, 120.

Blésois, 226.

Bliss, George, 317.

Blundell, E. A., 262.

Blythe, Joseph, 120, 330.

Board of War during the Revolution, 300.

Bodley, John E. C., *France*, by W. J. ASHLEY (Review), 353.

Boigne, Benoît de, 440, 442.

Boles, William, 697.

Bolivia, 449.

Bombay, 440; government of, 250, 253, 254; trade with, 257, 258.

Bonaparte, Joseph, 453.

Bonaparte, Napoleon, 21–37, 440–447, 450, 452–455.

Bonavista, Bay of, 44, 46, 60; Cape, 55.

Bonham, S. G., 256.

Bonwetsch, G. Nath., and Hans Achelis, *Hippolytus Werke*, I, by F. A. CHRISTIE (Review), 511.

Book of Trade, Bristol, 680–702.

Bordeaux, 237; martyrs at, 222.

Borneo, British ascendency in, 260, 261, 267, 269–272: flora and fauna of, 268; protectorate of, 269–272; trade with, 249, 256, 259.

Boston, 4, 275, 287, 298, 307, 421; records of, 6.

Boston Gazette, 293.

Boston Port Bill, 279.

Boston Public Library, 15.

Boudinot, Elias, 458, 459.

Bourgoing, 73.

Bouillon, the principality of, 226.

Bourne, Edward G., 421.

BOURNE, EDWARD G., *The Federalist*, edited by Paul L. Ford (Review), 172; *The History of South America*, translated by Adnah H. Jones (Review), 756; *Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission of the American Historical Association* (Reviews), 156, 738; *The West Indies*, by Amos K. Fiske, 763.

Bourne, Henry E., 410, 419.

BOURNE, HENRY E., *La Philosophie Sociale du XVIII^e Siècle et la Révolution*, par Alfred Espinas (Review), 524.

Bower, Mr., 222.

BOYD, CARL EVANS, *The County of Illinois*, 623; (editor) *Cases on American Constitutional Law*, by ROGER FOSTER (Review), 189.

Bradford, W., *History* by, 15.

Bradstreet, Governor, 241.

Brainerd, Hon. Lawrence, 315, 317, 318, 320.

Braintree, 297, 298.

Bravo del Norte, the, 445.

Brazil, 447.

Bréal, Michel, *Deux Études sur Goethe* (Review), 587.

Brearly, David, 457, 459–461, 463, 467–469.

Breckenridge, John C., 661.

Breton, Cape, 39, 40, 44–49, 55, 60.

Briçonnet, 221.

Bright, Thomas, 428.

Bringas, Fray Diego Manuel, 638.

Brinkerhoff, Jacob, 317.

Brion, Admiral de, 60.

Brissot, 439.

Bristol (England), 38, 48, 54, 55, 57, 60, 678–682, 700; the "commissioners" of, 686; the mayor of, 685, 690, 691, 692, 696, 701; merchants' guild of, 678; the Merchant Venturers of, 678–682, 685, 691, 692, 701; town council of, 679; trade of, 680, 681.

Bristol Parish, Virginia, The Vestry Book and Register of, edited by Churchill G. Chamberlayne (Review), 393.

British Colonial Office, the, 246, 258, 264 269, 271.

British Colonial Policy, Short History of, by H. E. Egerton (Review), 588.

British Dependencies in the Further East, The Administrative History of, by H. MORSE STEPHENS, 246.

British North Borneo Company, territories of, 246, 269.

Brittany, 49.

Brodhead, J. R. 474.

Brooke, Sir Charles Johnson, 267.

Brooke, Sir James (Rájá), 260–262, 267, 269, 271.

Brown, Aaron V., 658.
Brown, Alexander, *The First Republic in America*, by WM. WIRT HENRY (Review), 162.
Brown, George, 123.
Brown, Major, 241.
Brown, Nicholas, 113.
Brown, University, 417, 474.
Brownell, Eva P. (editor), *Historic New York* (Review), 547.
Brulé's Discoveries and Explorations, History of, by Consul W. Butterfield, by JAMES D. BUTLER (Review), 543.
Brunei, Sultan of, 260, 267, 269.
Brunet, 27, 29.
Bryan, Alfred C., *History of State Banking in Maryland*, by H. B. G. (Review), 762.
Brymner, Douglas, *Report on the Canadian Archives*, 1897 (Review), 394.
Bryn Mawr College, 416.
Buchanan, President, 91.
Buckingham, John, Bishop of Lincoln, 430.
Buena Vista, the battle of, 85.
Buenos Ayres, 449–454.
Buffalo, 410.
Building of the British Empire, by Alfred T. Story, by H. MORSE STEPHENS (Review), 712.
Bunce, James M., 317.
Burghley, The Great Lord, by Martin A. S. Hume, by H. MORSE STEPHENS (Review), 709.
Burke, Edmund, 306.
Burlington, 457.
Burma, government of, 264; trade with, 249.
BURNETT, E. C., *History of Presidential Elections*, by Edward Stanwood (Review), 391; *Introduction to the Study of History*, by Langlois and Seignobos, translated by G. G. Berry, with an introduction by F. York Powell (Review), 383; *Life of Major-General John Paterson*, by Thomas Eggleston (Review), 390.
Burney, Capt. Henry, 262.
Burnside, Gen., 673.
Burr, Aaron, 116, 120, 123, 331, 652.
Burr, George L., 418.
BURR, GEORGE L., *The Search for the Venezuela-Guiana Boundary*, 470.
Burrough, Stephen, 57.
Burton Library, of Detroit, 15.
Busch, Dr. Moritz, *Bismarck: Some Secret Pages of His History*, by CHARLES H. LEVERMORE (Review), 531.
BUTLER, JAMES D., *Forty Years a Fur Trader on the Upper Missouri*, by Charles Larpenteur edited by Elliott Coues (Review), 741; *History of Brulé's Discoveries and Explorations*, by Consul W. Butterfield (Review) 543; *Leading Events of Wisconsin History*, by Henry E. Legler (Review), 381.
Butler, Senator (of S. C.), 86, 87.
Butterfield, Consul W., *History of Brulé's Discoveries and Explorations*, by JAMES D. BUTLER (Review), 543.
Button, Thomas, admiral, 581.

Cabot, the derivation of, 58–60; John, 38–47, 54–61, 682; Lewis, 59; Michel, of Brittany, 59; Sebastian, 38, 45–48, 51–61.
Cabot, John and Sebastian, the Discovery of North America, by C. Raymond Beazley, by GEORGE P. WINSHIP (Review), 159.
Cabot Quater-Centenary, The Outcome of the, by HENRY HARRISSE, 38.
Cabots de La Fare, of France, 59.
Cabot's Discovery of North America, by G. E. Weare, by GEORGE P. WINSHIP (Review), 159.
Cabots, The Voyages of the, by Samuel E. Dawson, by GEORGE P. WINSHIP (Review), 159.
Cadiz, 238, 455; Córtes of, 645–647, 650; Junta of, 454; ships from, 324.
Cadoudal conspiracy, 24, 28.
Cahokia, 628, 630, 631.
Cairo, 440.
Calcutta, 248, 257, 261, 262.
Calderon, the Bridge of, 640.
CALDWELL, JOSHUA W. *John Bell of Tennessee, A Chapter of Political History*, 652.
Calhoun, John, 91, 93.
Calhoun, John C., 650; Correspondence of, 412, 413; papers of, 11.
Calhoun, John Ewing, 123.
California, 5, 318; University of, 410.
California, History of, III. and IV., by Theodore H. Hittell, by JOSIAH ROYCE (Review), 184.
Callahan, J. M., 418.

Calleja, the viceroy, 648, 651.
Callender, G. S., 413.
Cambacérès, 21.
Cambray, the Reformation at, 223.
Cambridge (Eng.), 421; the University of, 478.
Cambridge, vote of the town meeting of 1765, 20.
Camden, 5, 306.
CAMERON, HENRY C., *The Battles of Trenton and Princeton*, by William S. Stryker (Review), 731.
Campaigning in Cuba, by George Kennan, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 750.
Campeche, the coast of, 64.
Canada, 70, 76, 448; boundaries of, 66; land tenure in, 633; teaching of history in, 412.
Canada, History of, by William Smith, 129.
Canada, Proceedings of the Royal Society of, 60; *Transactions*, 39.
Canadian Archives, 1897, *Report on the*, by Douglas Brymner (Review), 392.
Cannon, Newton, 657.
Canterbury, Archbishops of, 430, 431, 434.
Canton, trade with, 249, 257.
Cape Colony, governor of, 267.
Cape of Good Hope, the, 442.
Carboneaux, Mons., 633, 634.
Cardenas, 244.
Career, The, of a Kansas Politician, by LEVERETT W. SPRING, 80.
Carew, Mrs., 694.
Carlisle (Pa.), 418, 667.
Carolinas, the, 49.
Carpenters Hall, in Philadelphia, 3.
Carrasqueda, Garcia de, 637, 643.
Cartellieri, Alexander (editor), *Ein Donaueschinger Briefsteller*, by CHARLES H. HASKINS (Review), 386.
Carthage, 18.
Carthagena, 243; attack on, 323, 325.
Cartier, Jacques, 45.
Casa de Contraction, 49, 50.
Cases on American Constitutional Law, edited by Carl E. Boyd, by ROGER FOSTER (Review), 189.
Castilblane, José Maria, 638.
Castile, 56; the Council of, 453.
Castlereagh, Lord, Eastern policy of, 252.
Catalonia, French troops in, 73.
Catron, John, 658.
Caulaincourt, 22.
Causes, The, of Cromwell's West Indian Expedition, by FRANK STRONG, 228.
Cavaignac, Godefroy, *La Formation de la Prusse Contemporaine*, by ULYSSES G. WEATHERLY (Review), 149.
Cavenagh, Col. Orfeur, 262–264.
Cavour, by Countess Evelyn Cesaresco, by WILLIAM R. THAYER (Review), 725.
Cemetery Ridge, 672, 675
Cesaresco, Countess Evelyn, *Cavour*, by WILLIAM R. THAYER (Review), 725.
Cévennes, the Reformation in the, 227.
Ceylon, trade with, 247.
Chabot, the derivation of, 58.
Chabot, the family of, 58–60; Philippe de, 60.
Challoner, Thomas, 235.
Chalmers, George, 420.
Chalons-sur-Saône, 452.
Chamberlain, Mellen, *John Adams, the Statesman of the American Revolution*, by SIMEON E. BALDWIN (Review), 367.
Chamberlayne, Churchill G., *The Vestry Book and Register of Bristol Parish, Virginia* (Review), 393.
Chambersburg, 667, 668.
Champagne, 226; the Reformation in, 227.
Champagny, Minister, 452, 453.
Chancellorsville, the battle of, 665, 666.
Chancelor, Richard, 61.
Chandernagor, 448.
Chandler, Zachariah, 318, 321.
Channer, Capt. G. N., 266.
Charles II., of England, 228, 229, 244, 679; charter of, to Connecticut, 274.
Charles III., of Spain, 69.
Charles IV., of Spain, 69, 77, 444, 450, 451, 453.
Charles V., the Emperor, 48, 50, 51, 53, 55.
Charles X. of Sweden, Cromwell and, The Diplomatic Relations between, by Guernsey Jones (Review), 194.
Charles the Great, by Hodgkin (Review), 192.
Charleston, 5, 114, 115, 125–128, 478–501; convention at, 660; election at, 119, 122, 123.
Charleston, The Siege of; Journal of Captain Peter Russell, 1779, 1780 (Document), 478.
Charlot, 22, 23, 25.
"Charter Day," 679.

Chase, Salmon P., 314, 331–347; papers of, 9, 10.
Chase, Secretary, Letters to, from the South, 1861 (Documents), 331.
Chase, William, Jr., 320.
Chastillons, the, 227; the religion of the, 218.
Chaucer, Geoffrey, 426, 427.
Cheyne, Sir John, 426.
Cheyne, T. K., *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile,* by GEORGE F. MOORE (Review), 505.
CHEYNEY, EDWARD P., *History of England under Henry the Fourth,* by James H. Wylie (Review), 145; *The Recantations of the Early Lollards,* 423.
Chicago, the City of, Municipal History and Present Organization of, by Samuel E. Sparling (Review), 577.
Chidley, Cape, 60.
Chihuahua, 643–645, 647.
Child, Sir Josiah, 247, 248.
China, trade with, 248–250, 257–259, 271.
China Sea, British possessions around, 246, 248, 265; trade in the, 253, 271.
Chinese, the, in British colonies, 246, 256, 258, 261, 265, 268.
Chinese War, the First, 256, 259, 271; the Second, 263.
Christ Church College, 424.
Christenverfolgungen, Die, im römischen Reiche vom Standpunkte des Juristen, von Dr. Max Conrat (Cohn), by A. C. McGIFFERT (Review), 513.
Christianity, The Growth of, by Joseph H. Crooker (Review), 191.
CHRISTIE, F. A., *Hippolytus Werke,* I, by G. Nath. Bonwetsch and Hans Achelis (Review), 511.
CHRISTY, MILLER, *Attempts toward Colonization: the Council for New England and the Merchant Venturers of Bristol,* 1621–1623, 678.
Church, Dr. Benjamin, 287, 288.
Church History Section of the American Historical Association, 417.
Cisneros, the viceroy, 454.
Citizenship and Salvation or Greek and Jew, by Professor Lloyd (Review), 384.
Civilization, An Essay on Western, in its Economic Aspects, by W. Cunningham, by B. PERRIN (Review), 135.
Civil Rights bill, the veto of the, 103.
Civil War, the, 660; records of the, 8.
Civil War, Recollections of the, by Charles A. Dana, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 568.
Clanvowe, Sir John, 426.
Clark, A. Howard, 410.
Clark, George Rogers, 72, 623–627, 631.
Clarke, Sir Andrew, 264, 266.
Clarke, W. Penn, 317.
Clay, Cassius M., 319.
Clay, Henry, 654, 657–659.
Clephane, Lewis, 317, 318, 320.
Cleveland, Chauncey F., 318.
Cleveland meeting of the American Historical Association, 409, 411.
Cleveland, President, 470.
Clifford, Sir Lewis, 426, 434.
Clinton, George, 120.
Clinton, Sir Henry, 479.
Clive in India, 248.
Clowne, Sir Cornelius, 434, 435.
(Cohn), Dr. Max Conrat, *Die Christenverfolgungen im römischen Reiche vom Standpunkte des Juristen,* by A. C. McGIFFERT (Review), 513.
Colbert, 448.
Colborne, Hon. Francis, 266.
Colección de Documentos Inéditos, 472.
Collections of the Minnesota Historical Society, VIII, 3 (Review), 199.
Collections of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, XIV., edited by R. G. Thwaites (Review), 199.
Colonial Office List, 247.
Colonization, Attempts toward; the Council for New England and the Merchant Venturers' of Bristol, 1621–1623, by MILLER CHRISTY, 678.
Colston, Edward, 680.
Columbia (S. C.), 112–114, 116, 119–125, 127, 128, 330.
Columbia University, 416, 418.
Columbus, Christopher, 38–43, 46, 50, 56.
Commission of Trade and Plantations, 231.
Committee of Seven, 1896, 18, 20; report of the, 411, 412.
Committee of Ten, 1893, 18.
Committees, of Congress, Reports of, 8; of Inspection, in Connecticut, 280–282.
Common School Revival in the United States, Horace Mann and the, by B. A. Hinsdale, by JOHN DEWEY (Review), 743.
"Concessions and Agreements of 1676," 459.

Condé, the Army of, 24, 28.
Condés, the, 227.
Condé-sur-Sarthe, Protestant peasantry of, 225.
Confederate Congress, the, 662.
Confederate States, archives of the, 7; principles of the, 332, 333, 337.
Congressional Committees, by Laurence G. McConachie (Review), 197.
Congress, the, of the United States, 652–660; Library of, 3, 470.
Congress, the Annals of, 15.
Congress, the Journals of (1775-1788), 8.
Congress, the Ordinances of (1775-1788), 8.
Connecticut, 305, 317, 318, 320; census of 1774 in, 278; government of, 273; records of, 6; state house of, 4.
Connecticut Loyalists, The, by G. A. GILBERT, 273.
Conquest of the West Indies, 234.
Consolateur, the, 452, 453.
Constitutional History of the American People, A, by Francis N. Thorpe, by ANSON D. MORSE (Review), 734.
Constitution of 1787, the, 306, 308, 46[illegible].
Constitution of the United States, The Proposed Amendments of the, during the First Century of its History, by Herman V. Ames, by ROGER FOSTER (Review), 177.
Contarini, Aluigi, 224, 225; Gasparo, 53, 55.
Continental Congress, 276, 280–284, 297–299, 301, 302, 328.
Continental System, the, of Napoleon, 417.
"Convention of Delegates" from Connecticut churches, 278.
Convention, The First Republican National, by GEORGE W. JULIAN, 313.
Coolidge, A. C., 413.
Cooper, William, 236, 237, 242.
Corbett, Julian S., *Drake and the Tudor Navy*, by W. F. TILTON (Review), 516; editor of *Papers relating to the Navy during the Spanish War*, 1585–1587 (Review), 194.
Cornelis, battle at, 251.
Cornell University, 410, 413, 418; history requirements of, 18.
Cornish, F. Warre (editor), *A Concise Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, by F. G. ALLINSON (Review), 385
Cornwallis, Lord, 479, 480, 483, 485, 495, 501.
Cotton, John, 236, 239, 240–242.
Couch, Gen., 668.
Coues, Elliott (editor), *Forty Years a Fur Trader on the Upper Missouri*, by Charles Larpenteur, by JAMES D. BUTLER (Review), 741.
Council of Safety in Conn., 284, 290.
County of Illinois, The, by CARL EVANS BOYD, 623.
Coventry (Conn.), Tories in, 280.
Coxe, Brinton, 464–466.
Craigie house, in Cambridge, 3.
Crawford, F. Marion, *Ave Roma Immortalis*, by A. L. FROTHINGHAM, JR., (Review), 508.
Creagh, C. Vandeleur, 270.
Crespin, the martyrology of, 218.
Crockett, David, 653, 655, 657.
Cromwell, his policy toward the West Indies, 228–245, 419.
Cromwell and Charles X. of Sweden, Diplomatic Relations between, by Guernsey Jones (Review), 194.
Cromwell's West Indian Expedition, The Causes of, by FRANK STRONG, 228.
Crooker, Joseph H., *The Growth of Christianity* (Review), 191.
Crowcombe Court, Somersetshire, 694.
Crumpe, Henry, 430.
Cuba, 2, 236, 240, 243.
Cuba, Campaigning in, by George Kennan, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 750.
Cuban and Porto Rican Campaigns, The, by Richard H. Davis, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 750.
Cuff, the negro-governor, 283, 284.
Cunningham, Dr. William, 417; *An Essay on Western Civilization in its Economic Aspects*, by B. PERRIN (Review), 135.
Curtin, Governor, 668.
Dahn, *Könige der Germanen*, VIII, 2 (Review), 759.
Dalhousie, government of, in India, 265.
Dana, Charles A., *Recollections of the Civil War*, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 568.
Daniel, Walker, 633.
"Danites," the, 93.
Danvers, F. C., 249.
Dartmouth, the committee of, 686.
Dautancourt, Major, 27–29.
Davis, Charles G., 318.

Davis, Garnett, 346, 347.
Davis, Henry Winter, 102.
Davis, Jefferson, 316, 662, 665, 666.
Davis, Richard H., *The Cuban and Porto Rican Campaigns*, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 750.
Dawson, John, 116.
Dawson, Dr. Samuel E., 39–44, 46–48, 51, 52, 54, 55; *The Voyages of the Cabots*, by GEORGE P. WINSHIP (Review), 159.
Dawson's *Historical Magazine*, 16.
Dayaks, the, in British Borneo, 260, 261, 267, 270.
Days and Dates, by Samuel N. Norton (Review), 191.
Dayton, Isaac, 317.
Deare, Councilman, 461.
De Baas, 237, 238.
Decaen, Gen., 441, 442, 446.
Declaration of Independence, 299, 300, 302, 312.
De Coigne, Jean Baptiste, 107, 108.
DE COSTA, B. F., *The Annals of the Voyages of the Brothers Nicolo and Antonio Zeno*, by Fred. W. Lucas (Review), 726.
Decrès, the Minister, 441, 444.
Defense of the Constitutions of the Government of the United States of America, A, 306–307, 310.
De Haan, Dr., 475.
Delaware, 114, 317, 318; documents relating to, 420.
Democratic party, the, 313, 315, 319; in Kansas, 81; in Tennessee, 657–661.
Democratic-Republican party, the, 653, 656, 657.
Demunbrunt, Thimothé, 631, 632, 635.
Dennis, Rev. Mr., 95.
Dennison, James, 318.
Dennison, W. H., 318.
Dent, Sir Alfred, 269.
Denver, General, J. W., 92–94.
De Sassenay, 452–455.
De Saussure, Chancellor, 113, 330.
Desmarêts, 25.
De Soto and His Men in the Land of Florida, by Grace King, by FRANK W BLACKMAR (Review), 541.
Detroit, 70; post at, 626.
Deux Études sur Goethe, by Michel Bréal (Review), 587.
Devereaux, F., 318.
De Vere, Stephen, 323, 328.
Devereux, Stephen, 323.
DEWEY, JOHN, *Horace Mann and the Common School Revival in the United States*, by B. A. Hinsdale (Review), 743.
Dexter, Roger, 430; Samuel, 117.
Diamond, Cape, 130, 131.
Dickey, Charles, 320.
Dickinson, John, 299, 420.
Dickson, Gen., 331.
Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, A Concise, edited by F. Warre Cornish, by F. G. ALLINSON (Review), 385.
Dindings, the, 261.
Diplomatic Relations of the Confederate States and England (paper), 418.
Diplomatic Relations, The, between Cromwell and Charles X. of Sweden, by Guernsey Jones (Review), 194.
Discourse upon Extortion, A, 286.
Discourse on Planting, 233.
Discourses on Davila, 294, 308, 310.
Discoveries of Sir Humphery Gilbert, 233.
Discovery of Guiana, 233.
Dissertation on the Canon and Feudal Law, A, 293.
District of Columbia, 317, 318, 320.
Dixon, Mrs. Archibald, *The True History of the Missouri Compromise and its Repeal*, by LEVERETT W. SPRING (Review), 560.
DODGE, THEODORE A., *Campaigning in Cuba*, by George Kennan (Review), 750; *In Cuba with Shafter*, by John D. Miley (Review), 750; *Our Navy in the War with Spain*, by John R. Spears (Review), 750; *The Cuban and Porto Rican Campaigns*, by Richard H. Davis (Review), 750; *The War with Spain*, by Charles Morris (Review), 750; *With Sampson through the War*, by A. M. Goode (Review), 750.
Donaldson, Thomas C., deceased, 594.
Donaueschinger Briefsteller, Ein, edited by Alexander Cartellieri, by CHARLES H. HASKINS (Review), 386.
Doniphan, Col., 90.
Dred Scott decision, the, 83.
Doolittle, Senator (of Wis.), 88.
Douglas County, 85, 86, 89.
DOUGLAS, HY. KYD, *Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War*, by G. F. R. Henderson (Review), 371.

Douglas, Stephen A., 81, 83, 87, 88, 661.
Drake and the Tudor Navy, by Julian S. Corbett, by W. F. TILTON (Review), 516.
Drake, E. F., 343, 344.
Draper, Simeon, 316.
Dufferin and Ava, the Marquis of, 54, 55, 57.
Duggan, Jeremiah, 130.
Dumouriez, 21, 22, 28, 35.
Dundas, Col. Thomas, 420.
Duniway, Clyde A., 413.
Dunkirk, 238.
Duplassey, Joseph, 628.
Dupleix, 448.
Duquetil, François, letter of, 109, 110.
Durango, the Bishop of, 644.
Durham (Conn.), 278.
Durkee, Charles, 318.
Duruy, Victor, *A General History of the World*, translated by Edwin A. Grosvenor (Review), 384.
Du Simitière, papers of, 420.
Dutch East India Company, 247.
Dutch Indies, the, 248, 251, 253, 263, 27[illegible].
Dutch, the, trade of, with Asia, 247, 24[illegible], 250, 261, 270, 271.
Dutch West India Company, 472, 474, 475.
Dwight, President, of Yale, 273, 414.

Earle, Alice Morse, *Home Life in Colonial Days*, by EDWARD G. PORTER (Review), 544.
Early, Gen. Jubal, 667.
East Africa, the French in, 448.
East Florida, the restoration of, 64, 67.
East India Company, 246–262, 264, 265, 269–271.
East Indies, the, 66.
East Jersey, 459
East Redding, church of, 279.
East Windsor, 288.
Eaton, John H., 658.
Ebers, Georg M., deceased, 200.
Economics, Quarterly Journal of, 17.
Eden, William, 54, 55.
Edward III, of England, 426, 433.
Edward IV, of England, 679.
Edward VI, of England, 51, 54, 57, 679.
Egerton, *Short History of British Colonial Policy* (Review), 588.
Eggleston, Thomas, *Life of Major-General John Paterson*, by E. C. B. (Review), 390.
Egyptian expedition, the, of Bonaparte, 440, 446.
Ela, Richard, 331, 333–336.
Election, the Presidential, of 1800, South Carolina in the (Documents), 111.
Elio, the governor, 453, 454.
Elizabeth, of England, 57, 432, 679; commercial policy of, 231.
Elliot, Captain Charles, 258.
Emancipation, the Cabinet discussion on the Proclamation of, 9.
Empire, The, and the Papacy, by T. F. Tout (Review), 142.
Enghien, Duc d', 21–37.
Enghien, The Execution of the Duc d', by SIDNEY B. FAY, 21.
England, 26, 28, 33, 35, 38, 45, 51, 52, 54, 57, 60, 61, 317, 478; attitude of John Adams towards, 306; the "common law" of, 458, 459; Lollards in, 423-438; policy of, under Cromwell, 228–245; relations of Spain with, in America, 62–78; teaching of history in, 412; trade of, with Asia, 247.
England and the Hundred Years' War, by C. W. C. Oman (Review), 587.
England, History of, under Henry the Fourth, by James H. Wylie, by EDWARD P. CHEYNEY (Review), 145.
English-American, The, or A New Survey of the West Indies, 233, 235.
English Constitution, The Origin and Growth of the, by Hannis Taylor, by CHARLES L. WELLS (Review), 348.
English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century, The History of, by G. P. Gooch, by FRANK STRONG (Review), 148.
Episcopalians in Conn., 278, 279.
Erpingham, Sir Thomas, 426.
Errett, Russell, 317.
Espinas, Alfred, *La Philosophie Sociale du XVIII^e Siècle et la Révolution*, by HENRY E. BOURNE (Review), 524.
Essequibo colony, the records of the, 475.
Essex County (N. J.), 460.
Essex, Robert Earl of, 683.
Estrada, Fray Manuel, 637, 643.
Ettenheim, 22, 23.
Europas, Geschichte, seit den Verträgen von 1815 bis zum Frankfurter Frieden von 1871, II, von Alfred Stern, by CHARLES M. ANDREWS (Review), 153.
Europe, 56, 58; the philosophical movement in, 293.

European Dependencies, Some Lessons from the Recent History of (paper), 419.
Everett, Edward, 3, 660, 661, 662.
Ewell, Gen., 665-671.
Execution, The, of the Duc d'Enghien, by SIDNEY B. FAY, 21.
Exeter, 696; the "commissioners" of, 686; the Merchant Adventurers of, 682.

Fail, Noël du, 225.
Fairfield county, (Conn.) Tories in, 278, 279.
Fairfax, Sir Thomas, 234, 235.
Falconer, William, 120, 330.
Farley, James S., 318.
Farley, Joseph, 317.
Farnam, Henry W., 413.
FAY, SIDNEY B., *The Execution of the Duc d'Enghien*, 21.
Federal Convention, the, 464-469.
Federalists, the, 124, 127, 128, 652-655; attitude of John Adams towards, 306, 308, 310, 311.
Federalist, The, 464; edited by Paul L. Ford, by EDWARD G. BOURNE (Review), 172.
Federated States, High Commissioner of the, 267.
Fee, J. G., 320.
Felletin, 222.
Ferdinand V. of Spain, 51, 53.
Ferdinand VII., of Spain, 451, 453, 640, 649.
Fertig, James W., *The Secession and Reconstruction of Tennessee*, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 187.
Field, David Dudley, The Life of, by Henry M. Field, by ROGER FOSTER (Review), 188.
Field, Henry M., *The Life of David Dudley Field*, by ROGER FOSTER (Review), 188.
Fiji, governor of, 267.
First Republic in America, The, by Alexander Brown, by WM. WIRT HENRY (Review), 162.
First Republican National Convention, The, by GEORGE W. JULIAN, 313.
Firth, Charles H., of Oxford, 105.
Fisher, George P., 414, 418.
Fisher, Herbert, *The Medieval Empire* (Review), 704.
Fiske, Amos K., *The West Indies*, by E. G. B. (Review), 763.
Fiske, Willard, 16.
Flanders, artisans from, 221, 224.
Fleury, 637.
Flores, Manuel de, 647, 648, 650, 651.
Floridas, the, 64, 65, 67, 70, 72; the boundary of, 70, 71, 76; plan to invade, 244.
Florida, De Soto and His Men in the Land of, by Grace King, by FRANK W. BLACKMAR (Review), 541.
Florida Blanca, 64, 69.
Floyd, Gen., 440.
Fogg, George C., 320.
Foote, Rev. Mr., of Alabama, 95.
Forbes, Archibald, *The Life of Napoleon III*, by CHARLES M. ANDREWS (Review), 360.
Force, Peter, 420.
Ford, Henry J., *The Rise and Growth of American Politics*, by JOHN W. PERRIN (Review), 592.
Ford, Paul L. (editor), *The Federalist*, by EDWARD G. BOURNE (Review), 172.
FORD, PAUL L., *The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, edited by Charles R. King (Review), 369.
FORD, WORTHINGTON C., *Letters to Washington and Accompanying Papers*, edited by Stanislaus M. Hamilton (Review), 729.
Forgotten Danger, A, to the New England Colonies (paper), 419.
Forty years a Fur Trader on the Upper Missouri, by Charles Larpenteur, edited by Elliott Coues, by JAMES D. BUTLER (Review), 741.
Foster, Dwight, 328, 330, 331; Ephraim, 658.
FOSTER, ROGER, *Cases on American Constitutional Law*, edited by Carl E. Boyd (Review), 189; *The Life of David Dudley Field*, by Henry M. Field (Review), 188; *The Life of Judge Jeffreys*, by H. B. Irving (Review), 195.
Foster, Senator Theodore, 113, 331.
Foster, William E., 410.
Fouché, 37.
Foulke, William D., *Life of Oliver P. Morton* (Review), 670.
Foxcroft, H. C., *The Life and Letters of Sir George Savile, Bart., First Marquis of Halifax*, by EDWARD PORRITT (Review), 519.
France, 24, 25, 28, 29, 33, 35-37, 45,

51, 207, 399, 426, 439, 442, 448, 453, 605, 768; interests of, in America 63–78; John Adams at the Court of, 300; policy of Cromwell toward, 228, 229, 232, 236–238, 241; teaching of history in, 412; trade of, with India, 249.
France, the Island of, 442.
France, by John E. C. Bodley, by W. J. ASHLEY (Review), 353.
France, Modern, 1789–1899, by André Lebon (Review), 151.
France, Story of, by Thomas E. Watson (Review), 586.
Francis I., of France, 224.
FRANCKE, KUNO, *Introduction à l'Histoire Littéraire*, par P. Lacombe (Review), 523.
Franklin, Benjamin, 67, 300.
Franklin, Governor, 287, 288.
Franklin, S. R., *Memories of a Rear-Admiral*, by GEO. E. BELKNAP (Review), 378.
Fraser, Capt. Malcolm, 130.
Frazer, J. G. (editor), *Pausanias's Description of Greece*, by J. IRVING MANATT (Review), 137.
Fredericksburg, the battle of, 665, 666, 670, 673.
Free Soil Parties, The Liberty and, in the Northwest, by Theodore C. Smith, by GEORGE W. JULIAN (Review), 180.
Free Soil party, the, 313–315, 321.
Free State, The, 80.
Free State party, the, 82, 83.
Fremantle, Lieut.-Col., 677.
Frémont, nomination of, 314.
Freneau, Peter, letter by, 120.
French Foreign Office, the, 445.
French India Company, the, 439.
French Naval School, the, 449.
French Reformation, The, and the French People in the Sixteenth Century, by H. HAUSER, 217.
French Revolution, the, 306, 308–310.
French, the, in Illinois, 629–635.
Friedenwald, Dr. Herbert, 323, 419, 420.
Friederici, Geo., *Skalpieren in Nordamerika*, by JAMES MOONEY (Review), 196.
FROTHINGHAM, A. L., JR., *Ave Roma Immortalis*, by F. Marion Crawford (Review), 508.
Fruin, Robert, deceased, 594.
Fugitive Slave Law, the, 83.
Fullerton, Robert, 254.
Fustel de Coulanges, par Paul Guiraud, by BENJAMIN TERRY (Review), 389.

Gadsden, Christopher, 113.
Gage, Thomas, 233–236, 241–243.
Gaillard, Theodore, 120, 330.
Garden, Alexander, 112.
GARDNER, H. B., *History of State Banking in Maryland*, by Alfred C. Bryan (Review), 762.
Garland, Hamlin, *Ulysses S. Grant, his Life and Character*, by FREDERICK W. MOORE, (Review), 377.
Garnett, Gen., 676.
Garrison, William Lloyd, 660.
Gâtinais, 59.
Geary, John W., 89, 90.
Gedanken und Erinnerungen von Otto Fürst von Bismarck, by MUNROE SMITH (Review), 536.
General Assembly of Conn., 276, 281, 282, 285–287, 289, 290.
General History of the World, A, by Victor Duruy, translated by Edwin A. Grosvenor (Review), 384.
Genet, Citizen, 71.
Geneva, the church of, 223, 226; ministers from, 226; Protestant presses at, 219.
Genovesi, 637.
George III., of England, 305, 320, 456; prayer for, 277.
George IV., of England, 254.
Georgetown, 128, 129.
Georgia, 114–116; expedition from, 72.
German Diet, the, 36.
Germany, 51, 210, 401, 610, 772; artisans from, 221; the Reformation in, 217.
Gerry, Elbridge, 464, 465.
Geschichte Europas seit den Verträgen von 1815 bis zum Frankfurter Frieden von 1871, II, von Alfred Stern, by CHARLES M. ANDREWS (Review), 153.
Gettysburg (Pa.), 417, 671–673, 676, 677.
Gettysburg, The Battle of, by JAMES F. RHODES, 665.
Gibraltar, 449; the restoration of, 64–67.
Gibson, Col., 316.
Giddings, J. R., 316, 318, 319, 321.
GILBERT, G. A., *The Connecticut Loyalists*, 273.
Gilbert, Gustav, deceased, 594.
Gilbert, Sir Humphrey, 233.
Gillespie, Rollo, 251.
Globe, the, 656.

Goche, Dr. Barnabe, 695, 696.
Godoy, Don Manuel, 69–79, 450, 451.
Goede Vrouw of Mana-ha-ta, by Mrs. John K. Van Rensselaer (Review), 590.
Goethe, Deux Études sur, by Michel Bréal (Review), 587.
Gomara, works of, 234, 235.
Gomera, 39, 40, 42, 43.
Gooch, G. P., *The History of Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century*, by FRANK STRONG (Review), 148.
Goode, A. M., *With Sampson through the War*, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 750.
GOODELL, T. D., *A History of Greece for High Schools and Academies*, by George W. Botsford (Review), 703.
Goodrich, Rev. Elizur, 278, 331.
Goodson, Vice-Admiral, 242.
Goodwin, Maud W., editor of *Historic New York*, (Review), 547.
Gookin, Daniel, 230.
Gorges, Sir Ferdinando, 678, 682–685, 690–693, 695–697.
Gorham, George C., *Life and Public Services of Edwin M. Stanton*, by FREDERIC BANCROFT (Review), 745.
Government, A Quaker Experiment in, by Isaac Sharpless, by HOWARD M. JENKINS (Review), 165.
Governor, The Provincial, in the English Colonies of North America, by Evarts B. Greene, by HERBERT L. OSGOOD (Review), 549.
Grafton, Third Duke of, Autobiography and Political Correspondence of Augustus Henry, edited by Sir Wm. R. Anson, by JAMES A. WOODBURN (Review), 715.
Grant, Ulysses S., 665, 677.
Grant, Ulysses S., his Life and Character, by Hamlin Garland, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 377.
Great Britain, 62–70, 204, 299, 397, 439–442, 445–456, 458, 470–476, 600, 766; the colonial administration of, 246.
Great Britain's Remembrancer, 237.
Great Lord Burghley, The, by Martin A S. Hume, by H. MORSE STEPHENS (Review), 709.
Greece, A History of, for High Schools and Academies, by George W. Botsford, by T. D. GOODELL (Review), 703.
Greece, Pausanias's Description of, edited by J. G. Frazer, by J. IRVING MANATT (Review), 137.
Greek and Roman Antiquities, A Concise Dictionary of, edited by F. Warre Cornish, by F. G. ALLINSON (Review), 385.
Greeley, Horace, 102, 315, 316, 319, 321.
Greene, Evarts B., *The Provincial Governor in the English Colonies of North America*, by HERBERT L. OSGOOD (Review), 549.
Greene, Gen. Nathanael, 420.
Greenland, 47, 48, 55.
Grim Chieftain of Kansas, The, by One Who Knows, 81.
Grose, William, 320.
GROSS, CHARLES, *Township and Borough*, by Frederic W. Maitland (Review), 143.
Grosvenor, Edwin A., 418; translator of *A General History of the World*, by Victor Duruy, (Review), 384.
Growth of British Policy, 228.
Growth of Christianity, The, by Joseph H. Crooker, (Review), 191.
Growth of Empire, The, by Arthur W. Jose, by H. MORSE STEPHENS (Review), 712.
Grundy, Felix, 654, 655, 658, 664.
Guadalajara, 641.
Guadalupe, Our Lady of, 640.
Guadeloupe, 442–444.
Guanahani, 39, 42, 43, 46.
Guantanamo, bay of, 323.
Guatemala, 243.
Guiana, 236, 242; British, 470, 473; Dutch, 472–475; French, 446; Spanish missions in, 473.
Guilford (Conn.), 240, 241.
Guiraud, Paul, *Fustel de Coulanges*, by BENJAMIN TERRY (Review), 389.
Guise, Gen., 323, 325.
Guises, the politics of the, 227.
Guiton, 26.
Guy, John, 692, 694.

Hadley, J. V., *Seven Months a Prisoner* (Review), 198.
Hagerstown (Md.), 667.
Hague, the, 474, 475.
Hakluyt, Richard, 57, 233, 234.
HALE, EDWARD E., JR., *The Household of the Lafayettes*, by Edith Sichel (Review), 197.
Halifax, Sir George Savile, Bart., First

Marquis of, The Life and Letters of, by H. C. Foxcroft, by EDWARD PORRITT (Review), 519.
Hall, book on Dutch East Indies, by, 248.
Hall, Hubert, *Red Book of the Exchequer* (Review), 760.
Halleck, Gen., 100, 667, 670, 671.
Hallowell, Abner, 318.
Halyton, church of, 430.
Hamilcar, 18.
Hamilton, Alexander, Gen., 78, 300, 310, 311, 464.
Hamilton, Alexander, *New Account of the East Indies*, 248, 252, 253.
Hamilton, Gen. H., invasion of Illinois by, 631.
Hamilton, Paul, 120, 330.
Hamilton, Stanislaus M., documents contributed by, 112; editor of *Letters to Washington and Accompanying Papers*, by WORTHINGTON C. FORD (Review), 729; editor of *The Writings of James Monroe*, I, II (Reviews), 170, 739.
Hamlin, Hannibal, 18, 91.
Hampton (Middlesex), cloth manufacture at, 223.
Hampton, Wade, 120, 126.
Hancock, Gen., 674, 676.
Handbook to Christian and Ecclesiastical Rome, by "H. M. and M. A. R. T." (Review), 191.
Hanotaux, M., 220.
Hanover Junction, 667.
Hareborough, church of, 430.
Harel, 27, 31, 32.
HARKNESS, ALBERT G., *Alla Ricerca della Via Caecilia*, by N. Persichetti (Review), 582.
Harlan, Senator (of Iowa), 86.
Harmar, Gen., 634.
Harper's Ferry, 670.
Harrisburg, 667-669, 671.
Harris, Isham G., 661-664.
Harris, Jeremiah George, 656.
Harrison, Benjamin, 655, 657.
Harrison, W. H., treaty with the Indians 108.
HARRISSE, HENRY, *The Outcome of the Cabot Quater-Centenary*, 38.
Hart, Albert B., 419; editor of *American History told by Contemporaries*, II (Review), 168.
HART, ALBERT B., *The Historical Opportunity in America*, 1; Introduction to *Letters to Secretary Chase from the South*, 1861 (Documents), 331.
Hartford, 282, 283, 286.
Hartford County, 286.
Hartley, Mr., 301.
Harvard College, 105, 293, 413; history requirements of, 18.
Harvard Memorial Society, 6.
Haskins, Charles H., 415.
HASKINS, CHARLES H., *Ein Donaueschinger Briefsteller*, edited by Alexander Cartellieri (Review), 386.
Hastings, Hugh, *Public Papers of Daniel D. Tompkins* (Review), 392.
Hastings, Warren, 248, 250, 252.
HAUSER, H., *The French Reformation and the French People in the Sixteenth Century*, 217.
Havana, 324; expedition against, 243.
Hawthorne, C. G., 318.
Hazard, R. G., 317, 318.
Helvetius, 649.
Henderson, G. F. R., *Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War*, by HY. KYD DOUGLAS (Review), 371.
Henry II., of France, 210.
Henry the Fourth, History of England under, by James H. Wylie, by EDWARD P. CHEYNEY (Review), 145.
Henry VII., of England, 51, 230.
Henry VIII., 45, 55, 432.
Henry, Patrick, 302, 625, 627–631.
HENRY, WM. WIRT, *The First Republic in America*, by Alexander Brown (Review), 162.
Herald of Freedom, the, 94.
Herbert, Lady, Memoirs of Lady Russell and, edited by Lady Stepney, by THOMAS W. HIGGINSON (Review), 713.
Hereford, Dr. Nicholas, 423, 428, 429, 437.
Héronville, heretics at, 226.
Herrera, María Manuela, 638.
Hickes, Thomas, 679.
Hidalgo and Morelos, by HENRY C. LEA, 636.
Hidalgo y Costilla, Miguel, 636–647, 649, 650.
Higginson, Rev. John, 240, 241.
HIGGINSON, THOMAS W., *Memoirs of Lady Russell and Lady Herbert*, edited by Lady Stepney (Review), 713.
Hill, A. P., 665-668, 674, 676.
Hillhouse, Mr., 331.

Hillsborough, 457.

Hinsdale, B. A., *Horace Mann and the Common School Revival in the United States*, by JOHN DEWEY (Review), 743.

Hippolytus Werke, I, von G. Nath. Bonwetsch und Hans Achelis, by F. A. CHRISTIE (Review), 511.

Hispaniola, 240, 241, 243, 324, 763.

Histoire Générale du IVe Siècle à nos Jours, edited by MM. E. Lavisse and A. Rambaud, IX., Napoléon, 1800–1815. (Review), 351.

Historical Development of Modern Europe, The, from the Congress of Vienna to the Present Time, II, by Charles M. Andrews, by CHARLES H. LEVERMORE (Review), 357.

Historical Geography of the British Colonies, 247.

Historical Manuscripts Commission, 20; report of the, 412.

Historical Manuscripts Commission of the American Historical Association, Reports of the, by EDWARD G. BOURNE (Review), 156, 738.

Historical Opportunity, The, in America, by ALBERT B. HART, 1.

Historic New York, edited by M. W. Goodwin, A. C. Royce, R. Putnam and E. P. Brownell (Review), 547.

Historic Towns of New England, edited by Lyman P. Powell (Review), 575.

History of the Barbarous Cruelties and Massacres committed by the Dutch in the East Indies, 248.

History of Barrington, Rhode Island, by Thomas W. Bicknell (Review), 198.

History of California, III. and IV., by Theodore H. Hittell, by JOSIAH ROYCE (Review), 184.

History of England under Henry the Fourth, by James H. Wylie, by EDWARD P. CHEYNEY (Review), 145.

History, The, of English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century, by G. P. Gooch, by FRANK STRONG (Review). 148.

History of Greece, A, for High Schools and Academies, by George W. Botsford, by T. D. GOODELL (Review), 703.

History, Method in, for Teachers and Students, by William H. Mace, by HENRY B. LEARNED (Review), 133.

History of Modern Europe, by Ferdinand Schwill, by J. H. R. (Review), 388.

History of Presidential Elections, by Edward Stanwood, by E. C. B. (Review), 391.

History, The, of South America from its Discovery to the Present Time, translated by Adnah H. Jones, by EDWARD G. BOURNE (Review), 756.

Hittell, Theodore H., *History of California*, III. and IV., by JOSIAH ROYCE (Review), 184.

"H. M. and M. A. R. T.," *Handbook to Christian and Ecclesiastical Rome* (Review), 191.

Hoar, E. R., 318.

Hobbes, 649.

Hodgkin, Thomas, *Charles the Great*, (Review), 192.

Holkar, the, 400.

Holland, 24, 441, 448, 473, 474; John Adams in, 300, 305; rights of, in Venezuela, 471–473.

Holmes, John, 457, 459.

Holmes vs. Walton: The New Jersey Precedent, by AUSTIN SCOTT, 456.

Holten, Doctor, 329.

Home Life in Colonial Days, by Alice Morse Earle, by EDWARD G. PORTER (Review), 544.

Homeric Palace, The, by Norman M. Isham, by J. R. WHEELER (Review), 758.

Honduras, 243.

Hong Kong, island of, 246, 256–259, 263, 271, 272.

Hood, Admiral, 71.

Hooke, William, 239, 241.

Hooker, Gen. Joseph, 665–670, 673.

Horace Mann and the Common School Revival in the United States, by B. A. Hinsdale, by JOHN DEWEY (Review), 743.

Hose, Charles, 268.

Household of the Lafayettes, The, by Edith Sichel, by EDWARD E. HALE, JR., (Review), 197.

House of Representatives, the, 314.

Houston, Sam, 660.

Houston, T. M., 318.

Howard, James M., 318.

Howard, Gen. O. O., 672.

Howell, Mark, 318.

Huber, Alphons, deceased, 594.

Hudson's Bay, 448, 631.
Huesca, Fray Joaquin, 637.
Huguenot party in France, the, 217, 227–229; songs of the, 219.
Hulin, Gen., 26, 29, 31.
Humboldt, 55.
Hume, Martin A. S., *The Great Lord Burghley*, by H. MORSE STEPHENS (Review), 709.
Humphreys, Gen., 673.
Hundred Years' War, England and the, by C. W. C. Oman (Review), 587.
Hunt, Jesse, 107.
Hunt, Mrs. Randall, 331, 332, 336–339.
Hunter, General, 97, 99, 100, 478.
Hunter, James, The Life and Times of, by Joseph M. Morehead (Review), 591.
Hunter, John, 120, 330.
Hutchinson, Governor, 298.

Ibbetson, Mr., 256.
Iles, George, 15, 410.
Illinois, 89, 317, 318, 320; political parties in, 314.
Illinois, the County of, by CARL EVANS BOYD, 623.
Illinois Indians, The, to Captain Abner Prior, 1794 (Documents), 107.
In Cuba with Shafter, by John D. Miley, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 750.
India, the Council of, 238; the English in, 440–442, 446; the French in, 440–442, 446, 448; government of, 246; 271, 272; trade with, 247.
India Office, publications of, 249.
Indiana, 80–83, 317, 318, 320; political parties in, 313, 314.
Indians, of the Illinois country, 626–628; in Mexico, 640; treatment of by the Spaniards, 233, 235, 243.
Indies, the Council of the, 56; land claims in the, 471, 472.
Industrial Experiments in the British Colonies of North America, by Eleanor L. Lord, by HERBERT L. OSGOOD (Review), 365.
Inquisition, the, 231, 232; the, of Mexico, 636–651; the Spanish, 636, 645.
Institutions of the Later Middle Ages, Historical Study of the (paper), 415.
Instructions of Braintree to representatives 297, 298.
International Arbitrations to which the United States has been a Party, History and Digest of the, by John B. Moore, by E. I. RENICK (Review), 563.
Introduction à l'Histoire Littéraire par P. Lacombe, by KUNO FRANCKE (Review), 525.
Introduction to the Study of History, by Langlois and Seignobos, translated by G. G. Berry, by E. C. B. (Review), 383.
Iowa, 317, 318, 320; the Republican party in, 314.
Ireland, 40–41, 54, 60, 240, 241; heresy in, 430.
Irving, H. B., *The Life of Judge Jeffreys*, by ROGER FOSTER (Review), 195.
Isabella, of Spain, 50.
Isham, Norman M., *The Homeric Palace*, by J. R. WHEELER (Review), 758.
Island Territory, Government of, by the United States (paper), 419.
Issoire, the Reformation at, 223.
Italy, 51, 58, 208, 400, 440, 609, 771.

Jackson, Andrew, 10, 97, 317, 653–658, 664.
Jackson, Samuel M., 418.
Jackson, Stonewall, and the American Civil War, by G. F. R. Henderson, by HY. KYD DOUGLAS (Review), 371.
Jamaica, 243, 244, 323; emigration from New England to, 230.
James, Capt. Thomas, 678, 681.
James I, of England, 683, 697, 699–701.
James, William, 424.
Jameson, J. Franklin, 156, 158, 412, 417, 474, 740.
Janis, Nicholas, 628.
Janssen, the works of, 217.
Japan, trade with, 248, 249.
Jastrow, Morris, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, by JOHN P. PETERS (Review), 502.
Java, English government of, 251; factories in, 247, 248, 253; plan to conquer, 251.
Jay, John, 64, 65, 68, 73, 468; the treaty of, 78.
Jefferson, Thomas, 116, 117, 120, 310–312, 320, 330, 331, 420, 652; foreign policy of, 2; letters of, 107; letters to, 112–116, 118–129; the papers of, 8, 10.
Jeffreys, Judge, The Life of, by H.B. Irving, by ROGER FOSTER (Review), 195.

Jenkins, Gaius, 94.

JENKINS, HOWARD M., *A Quaker Experiment in Government*, by Isaac Sharpless (Review), 165; *Philadelphia, The Place and the People*, by Agnes Repplier (Review), 551.

JENKS, JEREMIAH W., *Modern Political Institutions*, by Simeon E. Baldwin (Review), 582.

Jersey, the island of, 58, 59.

Jerusalem, Saladin and the Fall of the Kingdom of, by Stanley Lane-Poole, by J. R. JEWETT (Review), 707.

Jervois, Sir William, 264.

JEWETT, J. R., *Mohammeds Lehre von der Offenbarung quellenmässig untersucht*, von Dr. Otto Pautz (Review), 585; *Saladin and the Fall of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*, by Stanley Lane-Poole (Review), 707.

Jewish Religious Life after the Exile, by T. K. Cheyne, by GEORGE F. MOORE (Review), 505.

John Adams, the Statesman of the American Revolution, by Mellen Chamberlain, by SIMEON E. BALDWIN (Review), 365.

John and Sebastian Cabot, The Discovery of North America, by C. Raymond Beazley, by GEORGE P. WINSHIP (Review), 159.

John Bell of Tennessee, A Chapter of Political History, by JOSHUA W. CALDWELL, 652.

John Carter Brown Library, 15.

John, King of Portugal (1494), 48.

John of Gaunt, 425, 426, 430, 433.

Johns Hopkins Studies, 11.

Johns Hopkins University, 415, 418, 475.

Johnson, Andrew, 105, 104, 659.

Johnson, Cave, 658.

Johnson, F. C., 318.

Johnson, Doctor Samuel, 117.

Johnson, Justice Wm., 113.

Johore, Dutch negotiations with, 252; English negotiations with, 252, 253, 256, 267.

Jones, Adnah H., translator of *The History of South America*, by EDWARD G. BOURNE (Review), 756.

Jones, Batt, 91, 93; David, 317.

Jones, Guernsey, *The Diplomatic Relations between Cromwell and Charles X. of Sweden*, (Review), 194.

Jones, James C., 657; John Paul, 20, 420.

Jose, Arthur W., *The Growth of Empire*, by H. MORSE STEPHENS (Review), 712.

Journal of the most Remarkable Occurrences in Quebec, 1775, (Documents), 129.

Journals, The Secret, of Congress, 8.

Judicial Power and Unconstitutional Legislation, 464, 466.

Julian, George W., 317–320.

JULIAN, GEORGE W., *The First Republican National Convention*, 313; *The Liberty and Free Soil Parties in the Northwest*, by Theodore C. Smith (Review), 180.

Jurien, Admiral, 452.

Justin Winsor Prize, 411.

Kansas, 80–87, 89, 91–104, 318, 320, 321, 659; border troubles in, 316; the General Assembly of, a petition from, 86; territory, 82.

Kansas Politician, The Career of a, by LEVERETT W. SPRING, 80.

Kansas, The Grim Chieftain of, by One Who Knows, 81.

Kansas-Nebraska bill, the, 81.

Kaskaskia, 627, 628, 631–634.

Kaskaskia Indians, the, 107–109.

Kedah, kingdom of, 250.

Kelby, Wm., (librarian of the N. Y. Hist. Soc.), 129; deceased, 200.

Kemper, F., 318.

Kemper, Gen., 676.

Kennan, George, *Campaigning in Cuba*, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 750.

Kentucky, 5, 317, 318, 320, 631, 654, 658, 660; commerce and population of, 68; menace of, to Spain, 76; state of, in 1861, 344–347.

Ketcham, Solomon, 457, 459.

King, Charles R. (editor), *The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, by PAUL L. FORD (Review), 369.

King, Grace, *De Soto and His Men in the Land of Florida*, by FRANK W. BLACKMAR (Review), 541.

King, John A., 315.

King, Preston, 316–319, 321.

King, Rufus, 315; letter to, 112.

King, Rufus, *The Life and Correspondence of*, edited by Charles R. King, by PAUL L. FORD (Review), 369.

King's Mountain, the battle of, 654.

Kingsford, William, deceased, 395.
Kingston-upon-Hull, Trinity House of, 683.
Kirkpatrick, Chief Justice, 463.
Knies, Karl, deceased, 200.
Know-nothings, 313, 314, 316, 318, 319.
Knoxville, convention at, 652.
Könige der Germanen, by Dahn, VIII, 2 (Review), 759.
Kohl, 55.

Labrador, 45, 47–49, 55.
Labuan, island of, 260, 263, 269.
La Chambre Ardente, 222.
Lacombe, P., *Introduction à l'Histoire Littéraire*, by KUNO FRANCKE (Review), 523.
La Cosa, 48.
Lafayette, the Marquis de, 67, 68.
Lafayettes, The Household of the, by Edith Sichel, by EDWARD E. HALE, JR. (Review), 197.
La Ferté-Fresnel, the landlord of, 226.
La Formation de la Prusse Contemporaine, par Godefroy Cavaignac, by ULYSSES G. WEATHERLY (Review), 149.
La Granja, 74.
Lancaster (Pa.), 420, 667.
Lancaster, John of Gaunt, Duke of, 425, 426, 430, 433.
Lane, James Henry, 80–104.
Lane-Poole, Stanley, *Saladin and the Fall of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*, by J. R. JEWETT (Review), 707.
Lanfrey, 446.
Langres, 226.
Languedoc, 59; the Reformation in, 227.
La Plata, 56, 242.
Lapsley, G. T., 415.
Larned, J. N., 410.
La Rochelle, the Reformation at, 223.
Larpenteur, Charles, *Forty years a Fur Trader on the Upper Missouri*, edited by Elliott Coues, by JAMES D. BUTLER (Review), 741.
Las Casas, 50, 234, 235.
Las Cases, 37.
Lausanne, French Protestants at, 224.
Lauzon, Histoire de la Seigneurie de, par J. Edmond Roy, by GEORGE M. WRONG (Review), 578.
Lavisse, E., et A. Rambaud, editors of *Histoire Générale du IV^e Siècle à nos Jours*, IX: Napoléon, 1800–1815 (Review), 351.
Lawrence (Kan.): 80, 83, 85, 89, 90, 92–96, 99.
LEA, HENRY C., *Hidalgo and Morelos*, 636.
Leading Events of Wisconsin History, by Henry E. Legler, by JAMES D. BUTLER (Review), 381.
LEARNED, HENRY B., *Method in History for Teachers and Students*, by William H. Mace (Review), 133.
Leavenworth (Kan.), 91, 96, 100; Fort, 98; Library Association, 96.
Leavenworth Conservative, The, 98, 102.
Leblanc, Augustin, 638.
Lebon, André, *Modern France*, 1789–1895 (Review), 151.
Leclerc, 444.
Leclerc, Jean, 472.
Lecompton (Kan.), 83, 92; Constitution, the, 91, 92, 659; legislature, the, 316.
Lecourt, Étienne, 225.
Lécourt, heretics at, 226.
Lee, Capt., 324; Fitzhugh, 672; Robert E., 665–677.
Leete, Governor, 241.
Leicester, Lollards in, 427, 430, 431.
Leith, Sir George, 250.
Leland, E. D., 320.
Lenox Library, The, 15.
Leonard, Daniel, 208.
Le Puy, the reformation at, 223.
Letters to Caleb Strong, 1786, 1800 (Documents), 328.
Letters to Secretary Chase from the South, 1861 (Documents), 331.
Letters to Washington and Accompanying Papers, edited by Stainslaus M. Hamilton, by WORTHINGTON C. FORD (Review), 729.
Leverett, John, 230, 241.
LEVERMORE, CHARLES H., *Bismarck; Some Secret Pages of His History*, by Dr. Moritz Busch (Review), 531; *The Historical Development of Modern Europe*, II, by Charles M. Andrews (Review), 357.
Levermore, President of Adelphi College, 412.
Lex Mercatoria, 237.
Leypoldt, *American Catalogue* by, 15.
Liberator, the, 16.
Liberty and Free Soil Parties, The, in the Northwest, by Theodore C. Smith, by GEORGE W. JULIAN (Review), 180.

Life and Correspondence of Rufus King, edited by Charles R. King, by PAUL L. FORD (Review), 369.
Life of David Dudley Field, The, by Henry M. Field, by ROGER FOSTER (Review), 188.
Life of Judge Jeffreys, The, by H. B. Irving, by ROGER FOSTER (Review), 195.
Life and Letters, The, of George Savile, Bart., First Marquis of Halifax, by H. C. Foxcroft, by EDWARD PORRITT (Review), 519.
Life of Major-General John Paterson, by Thomas Eggleston, by E. C. B. (Review), 390.
Life of Napoleon III., The, by Archibald Forbes, by CHARLES M. ANDREWS (Review), 360.
Life of Nelson, The, by A. T. Mahan (Review), 719.
Life of Oliver P. Morton, by William D. Foulke (Review), 570.
Life and Public Services of Edwin M. Stanton, by George C. Gorham, by FREDERIC BANCROFT (Review), 745.
Life and Writings of John Adams, 113.
Light, Captain Francis, 249, 250.
Limousin, the Reformation in the, 221.
Lincoln, Abraham, 87, 97–103, 311, 314, 661, 664, 666, 667, 670, 677.
Lincoln, John Buckingham, Bishop of, 427, 430.
Liniers, Jacques de, 448–454.
LITTLE, CHARLES J., *The Making of Methodism*, by John J. Tigert (Review), 555.
Livingston, Governor, 460, 468, 469.
Lloyd, Professor, *Citizenship and Salvation or Greek and Jew* (Review), 384.
Lollardry in England, 217.
Lollards, Recantations of the Early, by EDWARD P. CHEYNEY, 423.
London, 37, 38, 55, 57, 73, 129, 426, 431, 475.
London Chronicle, 293.
Long Island, loyalists in, 285.
Longstreet, Gen., 665–668, 671, 672, 674–676.
Lord, Eleanor L., *Industrial Experiments in the British Colonies of North America*, by HERBERT L. OSGOOD (Review), 365.
Loreto, the House of, 637.
Los Dolores, the parish of, 635.
Louisiana, 70, 71, 443, 445–448; the boundaries of, 66; the cession of, 445.
Louis XII., of France, 224.
Louis XIV., 229.
Louis XV., 448.
Louis XVI., 70.
Louisville, political news from, 115.
Louverture, Toussaint, 443, 444.
Love, Andrew, 120, 330.
Love, Israel, 318.
Lovejoy, Rev. Owen, 315, 316, 318, 320.
Low, Sir Hugh, 260, 267.
Lowell, A. Lawrence, 415.
Lowtborough, church of, 430.
Loyalists, The Connecticut, by G. A. GILBERT, 273.
Loyalists, party of the, 273.
Lucas, C. P., 247.
Lucas, Fred. W., *The Annals of the Voyages of the Brothers Nicolo and Antonio Zeno*, by B. F. DECOSTA (Review), 726.
"Lutheranism," 225.
Luther, Martin, 217, 219, 649.
Lyons in the 16th century, 221, 223.
"Lyons, Poor Men of," 221.
Lyons, Protestant presses at, 219.

Macao, island of, 257.
Macartney, Lord, 258.
Mace, William H., *Method in History for Teachers and Students*, by HENRY B. LEARNED (Review), 133.
Maclean, Col., 130, 131.
Macpherson, Sir John, 230.
Macvane, S. M., 419.
Maddison, Sir Ralph, 237.
Madison Conference on History and Government, the Report of the, 18.
Madison, James, 4, 116, 129, 464; house of, at Montpellier, 3; letters to, 112, 116–118.
Madras, 248, 250, 262; government of, 253, 255, 257; trade with, 247.
Madrid, 64, 65, 67–69, 71–78, 307, 443, 450, 474.
Magellan, 50, 53.
Mahan, A. T., *The Life of Nelson* (Review), 719.
Mahârâjpur, battle of, 262.
Mahrattas, the, 439.
Maine, 318; Republican party in, 314; temperance movement in, 315.
Maitland, Frederic W., *Township and*

Borough, by CHARLES GROSS (Review), 143.
Making of Methodism, The, by John J. Tigert, by CHARLES J. LITTLE (Review), 555.
Malabar coast, trade with the, 247.
Malacca, acquired by England, 253, 254, 255, 261, 262, 270; as a Portuguese colony, 259; given to the Dutch, 252.
Malay Peninsula, British dependencies in, 246, 254, 255, 261–272; Dutch trade with, 253; English trade with, 248–255, 261–268.
Malay Protectorate, the, 267–269, 271, 272.
Malays, the, in British colonies, 246, 258, 260, 261, 268, 270.
Maldonado, 453.
Malipiero, Domenico, 50.
Mallet-Prevost, Mr. S., 475.
Malta, 446.
Malynes, 237.
Mana-ha-ta, Goede Vrouw of, by Mrs. John K. Van Rensselaer (Review), 590.
MANATT, J. IRVING, *Pausanias's Description of Greece*, edited by J. G. Frazer (Review), 137.
Manifesto, Milton's, 233.
Mann, Abijah, 317, 318, 320.
Mann, Horace, and the Common School Revival in the United States, by B. A. Hinsdale, by JOHN DEWEY (Review), 743.
Mansfield, Rev. Richard, 277.
Manuscripts Commission, the Historical, 11, 20, 156, 412, 738.
Manuscripts, the Department of, at Washington, 7.
Marbois, 445, 447.
Marbury *vs.* Madison, 464.
Marietta, 635.
Markham, Sir Clements, 44–47.
Markle, Gen. Joseph, 317.
Marlborough, Fort, 248, 253.
Marshall, John, 464, 468.
Martinique, 443, 444.
Martinsburg, 666.
Martyr, Peter, 50, 55, 60.
Mary, of England, 51, 432.
Maryland, 114, 116, 117, 123, 126, 317, 318, 634, 667, 670, 671.
Maryland Heights, 670.
Maryland, The History of State Banking in, by Alfred C. Bryan, by H. B. G. (Review), 762.
Mason, Edward G., deceased, 594.
Mason, Senator J. M. (of Va.), 86.
Mason, General S. T., 122.
Massachusettensis, 298.
Massachusetts, 4, 10, 299, 303, 306, 317, 318, 328, 330, 465, 466; in 1774, 279; in 1776, 287.
Massachusetts Bay, letter of Roger Williams to the General Court of, 239.
Massachusetts Emigrant Aid Company, 83.
Massachusetts Gazette, 298.
Massachusetts Historical Society, the, 10.
Massachusetts, Republican committee of, 313.
Masséna, 441.
Matthews, Mayor, of N. Y., 287.
Mazarin, Cardinal, 229, 236–238.
McCarty, Capt., 630.
McConachie, Lauros E., *Congressional Committees* (Review), 197.
McCormick, J., 332, 333.
MCGIFFERT, A. C., *Die Christenverfolgungen im römischen Reiche vom Standpunkte des Juristen*, von Dr. Max Conrat (Cohn) (Review), 513.
McHenry, 310.
McKee, John, 289.
McLaughlin, Andrew C., 411, 420.
McMaster, J. B., 13.
McMillan, John H., 317.
McMurdy, R., 344–346.
McPherson, John, 120.
Meade, Gen. George G., 670-674, 677.
Meaux, the bishop of, 218; the Fourteen of, 222, 223; tracts printed at, 219; in the 16th century, 218, 221–223.
Medieval Empire, The, by Herbert Fisher (Review), 704.
Melton Mowbray, church of, 430.
Melville, Henry, *The Ancestry of John Whitney*, by MELVILLE M. BIGELOW (Review), 193.
Memoirs of Lady Russell and Lady Herbert, 1623–1723, edited by Lady Stepney, by THOMAS W. HIGGINSON (Review), 713.
Memories of a Rear-Admiral, by S. R. Franklin, by GEO. E. BELKNAP (Review), 378.
Memphis, resources of, in 1861, 340–342.
Méneval, 36.
Merced, the order of, 637.
Merchant Venturers of Bristol, the, 678–682, 685, 691, 701.

Merchant Venturers Technical College, 680.

Merqui, massacre of English at, 249.

Method in History for Teachers and Students, by William H. Mace, by HENRY B. LEARNED (Review), 133.

Methodism, The Making of, by John J. Tigert, by CHARLES J. LITTLE (Review), 555.

Metz, martyrdom at, 221.

Mexico, 445; accounts of, 234, 235; the Archbishop of, 640, 642; the city of, 85, 87; emigration to, 240, 241; the Gulf of, 64, 65, 237, 242, 445, 447; the Inquisition of, 636–651.

Mexico and the United States, by Matias Romero, by G. P. W. (Review), 580.

Michelet, 217.

Michiel, Giovanni, 218.

Michigan, 317, 318, 320, 411; political parties in, 313; the University of, 420.

Michoacan, 636.

Middle Ages, the social organization of the, 436, 437.

Middlesex County (N. J.), 460, 461.

Middle States, A History of the Baptists of the, by Henry C. Vedder, by WM. H. WHITSITT (Review), 553.

Middletown, 288.

"Miles O'Reilly" papers, the, 98.

Miley, John D., *In Cuba with Shafter*, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 750.

Milton, John, 232, 233.

Minnesota, 317, 318, 320.

Minnesota Historical Society, Collections of, VIII, 3 (Review), 199.

Minorca, the restoration of, 64, 67.

Minto, Lord, 251.

Mississippi, the, 62, 65–73, 76, 78, 445, 623, 626, 629, 635.

Missouri, 9, 80, 89, 90, 95, 98, 99, 317, 318, 320; border troubles in, 316.

Missouri Compromise, the, 314, 315, 317, 321, 659.

Missouri Compromise, The True History of the, and its Repeal, by Mrs. Archibald Dixon, by LEVERETT W. SPRING (Review), 560.

Mobile, British post at, 65; the cession of, 64.

Modern American Oratory, by Ralph C. Ringwalt (Review), 392.

Modern Europe, The Historical Development of, II., by Charles M. Andrews, by CHARLES H. LEVERMORE (Review), 357.

Modern Europe, History of, by Ferdinand Schwill, by J. H. R. (Review), 388.

Modern France, 1789–1895, by André Lebon (Review), 151.

Modern Political Institutions, by Simeon E. Baldwin, by JEREMIAH W. JENKS (Review), 582.

Modyford, Thomas, 237, 243.

Mohammeds Lehre von der Offenbarung quellenmässig untersucht, von Dr. Otto Pautz, by J. R. J. (Review), 585.

Molière, 637.

Mollon, Barthelémy, 221.

Moluccas, trade of the, 256.

Moniteur, the, 32.

Monmouth, the battle of, 456.

Monmouth County, 457, 459, 460.

Monroe, James, 73, 74, 78, 116, 118, 122, 125, 420; foreign policy of, 2; papers of, 8.

Monroe, James, The Writings of, I, II, edited by Stanislaus M. Hamilton (Reviews), 170, 739.

Monroe Doctrine, The, by W. F. Reddaway, by GEORGE F. TUCKER (Review), 180.

Montague, Sir John, 425, 437.

Montbéliard, the principality of, 226.

Montchrestien, 223.

Montevideo, 449, 451, 453–455.

Montgomery, Col., 630.

Montgomery, Gen., before Quebec, 129–131.

Monticello, 3, 116.

MOONEY, JAMES, *Skalpieren in Nordamerika*, von Geo. Friederici (Review), 196.

MOORE, FREDERICK W., *Recollections of the Civil War*, by Charles A. Dana (Review), 568; *The Secession and Reconstruction of Tennessee*, by James W. Fertig (Review), 187; *Ulysses S. Grant, his Life and Character*, by Hamlin Garland (Review), 377.

MOORE, GEORGE F., *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*, by T. K. Cheyne (Review), 505.

Moore, John B., *History and Digest of the International Arbitrations to which the United States has been a Party*, by E. I. RENICK (Review), 563.

Mora, Fray Simon de la, 641.

Moreau, 21.

Morehead, Joseph M., *The Life and Times of James Hunter* (Review), 591.

Morelos, Hidalgo and, by HENRY C. LEA, 636.
Morelos, José Maria, 647–651.
Morgan, E. D., 317, 320, 321.
Morris, Charles, *The War with Spain*, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 750.
Morris, Gouverneur, 65, 464, 469.
Morris, Robert, 457.
MORSE, ANSON D., *The Constitutional History of the American People*, by Francis N. Thorpe (Review), 734; *The Politics of John Adams*, 292.
Morton, J. Sterling, 89.
Morton, Oliver P., 318, 321.
Morton, Oliver P.; Life of, by William D. Foulke (Review), 570.
Moses, Bernard, 410.
Mosquito Indians, 325.
Mount Vernon, the purchase of, 3.
Mughal Empire, the, 271.
Mun, mercantile system of, 237.
Municipal History and Present Organization of the City of Chicago, by Samuel E. Sparling (Review), 577.
Municipal Life in the Twelfth Century (paper), 415.
Münster, the treaty of, 471, 474.
Murat, 22, 26–30.
Murchison, Mr., 256.

Nantes, Revocation of the Edict of, 223.
Napier, Lord, 258.
Napoleon I, 673; attitude of, toward the Inquisition, 645, 649.
Napoléon, 1800–1815, *Histoire Générale du IVe Siècle à nos Jours*, edited by MM. E. Lavisse and A. Rambaud, IX (Review), 351.
Napoleon's Plans for a Colonial System, by W. M. Sloane, 418, 439.
Napoleon III, 446.
Napoleon III, The Life of, by Archibald Forbes, by CHARLES M. ANDREWS (Review), 360.
Nashville, 654, 655, 658; the University of, 654.
National Education Association, report of the committee of, 412.
Navagero, 55.
Navy, the, during the Spanish War, 1585–1587, Papers relating to, edited by Julian S. Corbett (Review), 194.
Nebraska, 89; the organization of, 659.
Nebraska City, 102.
Négociations Secrètes, 472.
Negrais, massacre of English at, 249.
Negri Sembilan, states of, 266.
Nelson, The Life of, by A. T. Mahan (Review), 719.
Netherlands, 212, 491, 613, 774.
New Account of the East Indies, 248, 252.
New Amsterdam, records of, 6.
New Brunswick, loyalists in, 291.
Newcastle, Duke of, 323, 324.
Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Society of Merchant Adventurers of, 682.
Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Trinity House of, 683.
New England, 126, 606; the colonization of, 684–702; connection of with Cromwell's West Indian expedition, 230, 238–242; the Federalists in, 328; town meetings of, 6.
New England Company, see New England, Council for.
New England, Council for, 678, 684–702.
"New England, The Great Patent of," 684.
New England, the trade with, 684–701.
New England, Historic Towns of, edited by Lyman P. Powell (Review), 575.
New England History Teachers' Association, 411, 413.
New England's Lamentation for Old England's Errours, 105.
Newfoundland, 40–42, 44, 45–47, 55, 448; fisheries of, 65, 66, 301.
Newfoundland, History of, by Anspach, 54.
New Hampshire, 5, 317, 318, 320, 420.
New Hampshire, Temporary Acts and Laws of His Majesty's Province of (Review), 591.
New Haven (Conn.), 5, 239.
New Haven Colony Historical Society, 415.
New Haven Meeting, The, of the American Historical Association, 409.
New Jersey, 287, 317, 318, 320, 456–461, 463–469, 660; the legislature of, 456 461–463; records of, 6; the Supreme Court of, 468.
New Jersey Archives, 16.
"New Jersey plan," the, 465–467, 469.
New Jersey Precedent, The, Holmes vs. Walton, by AUSTIN SCOTT, 456.
New London county, 288.
New Orleans, 332, 447; Spanish relations with, 62, 68, 70, 71, 75, 76.
Newspaper Files, Annotated Catalogue of, by Emma Blair (Review), 593.

Newton, Sir Isaac, "Table of the Assays, Weights, and Values of Foreign Silver and Gold Coins," of, 347.
Newton, T. P., 317.
Newtown (Conn.), 278, 279.
New York, 68, 111, 278, 284, 287, 317, 318, 320, 328, 410, 653, 668, 669; the city of, 456; political parties in, 313, 314; politicians of, 315–317.
New York Historical Society, diary published by, 129.
New York, Historic, edited by M. W. Goodwin, A. C. Royce, R. Putnam and E. P. Brownell (Review), 547.
New York Times, 321.
New York Tribune, 102.
Nicaragua, 243.
Nice, the county of, 59.
Nicholas, Mr., 113, 122.
Nicholas, Thomas, 234.
Nightingale, A. F., 412.
Niles, John M., 320.
Niles's Register, 15, 16.
Nimes, the diocese of, 226; the Reformation at, 223.
Nivernais, 226.
Nizam, the, 440.
Nootka Sound, 71.
Norcross, Dr. George, 418.
Nordamerika, Skalpieren in, von Geo. Friederici, by JAMES MOONEY (Review), 196.
Normandy, 27; the reformation in, 225, 226.
North America, Cabot's Discovery of, by G. E. Weare, by GEORGE P. WINSHIP, (Review), 159.
North America, The Discovery of; John and Sebastian Cabot, by C. Raymond Beazley, by GEORGE P. WINSHIP (Review), 159.
North American Review, 16.
North Borneo Company, government of, 268–272.
North Carolina, 114–116, 126, 465, 652; records of, 6.
Northampton, 427.
Northumberland, Henry Percy, Duke of, 425.
Northwest Territory, the, 652; government of, 635; the population of the, 68.
Norton, Samuel N., *Days and Dates* (Review), 191.
Norwalk, 289.
Norwich, 287, 288; the Bishop of, 425.
Nott, Mr., 331.
Novanglus, 298.
Nova Scotia, 49, 448; loyalists in, 291.

"Oath of Fidelity" in Conn., 286.
Oaxaca, the Bishop of, 651.
Ocaña, 56.
Ogle, Sir Chaloner, 323, 325.
Ohio, 317, 318, 320; political parties in, 314; Republican committee of, 313.
Ohio Purchase, shares in the, 331.
Ohio River, the, 66, 71, 72, 623–626, 629, 634, 635.
Oldcastle, Sir John, 426.
Old England's Errours, New England's Lamentation for, 105.
Oliver, Chief Justice, 298.
Oman, C. W. C., *England and the Hundred Years' War* (Review), 587.
Ord, Sir Harry, 264.
Ordener, 22.
Offenburg, 22.
Oléron, Protestants in, 225.
Ordinance of 1787, the, 625, 635.
Orléanais, 226.
O'Reilly, 449.
Original Papers relating to the Expedition to Carthagena, 323.
Origin and Growth of the English Constitution, The, II., by Hannis Taylor, by CHARLES L. WELLS (Review), 348.
Orinoco, the, 242, 243, 472, 473.
Osgood, H. L., 416.
OSGOOD, HERBERT L., *Industrial Experiments in the British Colonies of North America*, by Eleanor L. Lord (Review), 365; *The Provincial Governor in the English Colonies of North America*, by Evarts B. Greene (Review), 549.
Otis, James, 292.
Our Lady of los Remedios, 640.
Our Navy in the War with Spain, by John R. Spears, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 750.
Outcome, The, of the Cabot Quater-Centenary, by HENRY HARRISSE, 38.
Overton, John, 658.
Oviedo, 50, 55.
Oxford, the Lollards in, 424–432, 437; the University of, 423.

Pacific Ocean, the, 56, 445.
Padua, the University of, 4.
Pahang, 266.

Palissy, Bernard, 222.
Palos, 50.
Panama, 243, 325.
Pangkor, island of, 261.
Paola (Kan.), 99.
Papacy, The Empire and the, by T. F. Tout (Review), 142.
Papers relating to the Navy during the Spanish War, 1585–1587, edited by Julian S. Corbett (Review), 194.
Paraguay, 449.
Paris, 21–23, 25–27, 32, 36, 37, 65, 68, 73, 74, 442; the Archbishop of, 225; the Governor of, 26; Parliament of, trials for heresy before the, 222; the, Reformation at, 223; strikes at the, in 16th century, 221.
Parker, Charles S. (editor), *Sir Robert Peel, from His Private Papers*, by EDWARD PORRITT (Review), 721.
Parkman, Francis, 13.
Parliament of Paris, territory of the, 226.
Parma, 445.
Paterson, Major-General John, The Life of, by Thomas Eggleston, by E. C. B. (Review), 190.
Paterson, William, 465–469.
Pateshulle, Peter, 426.
Paul, the Czar, 440, 441.
Pausanias's Description of Greece, edited by J. G. Frazer, by J. IRVING MANATT (Review), 137.
Pautz, Dr. Otto, *Mohammeds Lehre von der Offenbarung quellenmässig untersucht*, by J. R. J. (Review), 585.
Pawnee (Kan.), 81, 82.
Peasants' Rebellion, the, of 1381, 433.
Peckham, Sir George, 233.
Peel, Sir Robert, from His Private Papers, edited by Charles S. Parker, by EDWARD PORRITT (Review), 721.
Pemberton, J., 420.
Pembroke, the Earl of, 699–702.
Penang, government of, 250, 254, 261, 265, 270.
Pendleton, N. G., 107.
Penn, General, 232, 236, 243, 244.
Pennsylvania, 66, 68, 111–115, 118, 121, 122, 125, 317, 318, 320, 330, 671; courts of, 464; the history requirements of the University of, 18; the invasion of, 665, 667–677; legislature of, 459; records of, 6; Republican committee of, 313; Republican party in, 314.
Pennsylvania Railroad, the, 668, 669.
Pensacola, British post at, 65; the restoration of, 64.
Pensionary, the, of Holland, 474.
"People's Party, the," of Indiana, 313, 314.
Perak, 266, 270; Sultan of, 261, 266.
Percy, Henry, Duke of Northumberland, 425.
PERRIN, B., *An Essay on Western Civilization in its Economic Aspects*, by W. Cunningham (Review), 135.
PERRIN, JOHN W., *The Rise and Growth of American Politics*, by Henry J. Ford (Review), 592.
Persichetti, N., *Alla Ricerca della Via Caecilia*, by ALBERT G. HARKNESS (Review), 582.
Peru, accounts of, 235.
Peter, Hugh, Thomas Shepard to, 1645 (Documents), 105.
PETERS, JOHN P., *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, by Morris Jastrow (Review), 502.
Peters, Rev. Samuel, 274, 288.
Petit, Pierre, 59.
Petrarch, the First Modern Scholar and Man of Letters, by James H. Robinson, by FERDINAND SCHWILL (Review), 514.
Peyton, Capt, 324.
Philadelphia, 72–74, 114, 116, 119, 121, 124, 280, 283, 299, 306, 469, 669; caucus at, 112; despatch from (1856), 318.
Philadelphia, The Place and the People, by Agnes Repplier, by HOWARD M. JENKINS (Review), 551.
Philip IV, of Spain, 228.
Philippines, the, 256, 249.
Phillips, Wendell, 660.
Philosophie Sociale, La, du XVIIIe Siècle et la Révolution, par Alfred Espinas, by HENRY E. BOURNE (Review), 524.
Pichegru, 28.
Pichon, 444.
PICKARD, SAMUEL T., *The Underground Railroad from Slavery to Freedom*, by Wilbur H. Siebert (Review), 557.
Pickering, Timothy, 310.
Pickett, Gen., 674–676.
Piedmont, 445.
Pierce, President, 81, 87, 315.
"Piers the Plowman," 435.

Pinckney, Charles, 112, 113; letters by, 113–129.
Pinckney, Charles Cotesworth, 112, 113, 121, 310, 330.
Pinckney, Life of General Thomas, 113.
Pinckney, Thomas, of S. C., 73–78, 112.
Pinckney, Rev. Dr. C. C., 113.
Pitaval, *Causes Célèbres* of, 537.
Pitt: Some Chapters of his Life and Times, by Lord Ashbourne, by GOLDWIN SMITH, (Review), 527.
Pittsburg, 629; convention of 1856 at, 313.
Plantins' house, in Antwerp, 2.
Plata, Rio de la, 449.
Plate Country, the, 449, 451.
Plymouth, 5, 683; the committee of, 686, 687; the mayor of, 685.
Plymouth Company, 684.
Poitou, 226; the Chabots of, 59, 60.
Poland, 445.
Political Economy, Journal of, 17.
Political Science Quarterly, the, 17.
Politics of John Adams, The, by ANSON D. MORSE, 292.
Polk, James K., 655, 657, 658.
Pollison, C. M. K., 318, 320.
Pondicherry, 440, 442, 448.
Pontoise, 226.
Pope, Gen., 674.
Pope, G. H., 678, 679, 686.
Popham, Admiral, 449, 451.
Popp, 28.
PORRITT, EDWARD, *The Life and Letters of Sir George Savile, Bart., First Marquis of Halifax*, by H. C. Foxcroft (Review), 519; *Sir Robert Peel, from His Private Papers*, edited by Charles S. Parker (Review), 721.
PORTER, EDWARD G., *Home Life in Colonial Days*, by Alice Morse Earle (Review), 544.
Portland, the Duke of, 478.
Porto Bello, 242, 243.
Porto Rican, The Cuban and, Campaigns, by Richard H. Davis, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 750.
Portrait Miniatures, by George C. Williamson (Review), 196.
Portugal, 48, 49, 51, 447, 448, 610, 772; possessions of, in the East, 257, 259; trade of, with Asia, 247.
Postell, Col. J., 120, 330.
Potomac, the, 666, 670, 671; the Army of the, 665, 667, 669, 670, 673, 677.
Pottinger, Sir Henry, 258.
Powell, Captain, 242.
Powell, Lyman P., *Historic Towns of New England* (Review), 575.
Powell, F. York, introduction to *Introduction to the Study of History*, by Langlois and Seignobos, translated by G. G. Berry, by E. C. B. (Review), 383.
Pownall, Thomas, 420.
Praemunire, Statute of, 428.
Prairie du Rocher, 628, 632.
Prentiss of Mississippi, 316.
Près de Ville, 131.
Presidential Elections, History of, by Edward Stanwood, by E. C. B. (Review), 391.
Preston, Capt., defense of, 298.
Price, Dr., 310.
Price, General Sterling, 99.
Prices and Price Movements in the Confederate States during the Civil War (paper), 413.
Prince of Wales's Island, 250; government of, 254, 255, 262, 271.
Princeton, The Battles of Trenton and, by William S. Stryker, by HENRY C. CAMERON (Review), 731.
Pring, Capt. Martin, 682.
Prior, Captain Abner, The Illinois Indians to, 107.
Propaganda map, the, 48.
Propos Rustiques, 225.
Protectorate, the, 228.
Providence, 5; records of, 6; Public Library of, 410.
Providence Journal, the, 113.
Provincial Governor, The, in the English Colonies of North America, by Evarts B. Greene, by HERBERT L. OSGOOD (Review), 549.
Provisors, Statute of, 428.
Prusse Contemporaine, La Formation de la, par Godefroy Cavaignac, by ULYSSES G. WEATHERLY (Review), 149.
Prussia and France, peace between, 73.
Pryn, Edward, 679.
Public Papers of Daniel D. Tompkins, edited by Hugh Hastings (Review), 392.
Puebla, 60; the Bishop of, 648, 649; Our Lady of, 640.
Puisaye, 226.
Pulo Penang, island of, 250–255, 261, 262.
Punjab police, the, 270.

Purchas, Samuel, 234, 235.
Puritan Movement, the, in England, 217.
Puritans in America, 295, 296.
Purvey, John, 431, 438.
Putnam, Gen. Rufus, 3, 331.
Putnam, Ruth, editor of *Historic New York* (Review), 547.
Pyrenees, Protestantism in the valleys of the, 226; Spanish forces in the, 71.

Quaker Experiment in Government, A, by Isaac Sharpless, by HOWARD M. JENKINS (Review), 165.
Quantrill, the raid of, 99.
Quebec in 1775, 129; the Chief Justice of, 129, 132.
Quebec, Journal of the most remarkable Occurrences in, 1775 (Documents), 129.
Queda, Kingdom of, 250.
Querétaro, the commissioner at, 639.

Rabbe, 26.
Race, Cape, 39, 41, 44.
Racine, 637.
Raemond, Florimond, 218, 225.
Raffles, Thomas Stamford, 251–253, 255, 271.
Raleigh, Sir Walter, 233–235.
Rambaud, A., et E. Lavisse, editors of *Histoire Générale du IVe Siècle à nos Jours*, IX., Napoléon, 1800–1815 (Review), 351.
Ramsay, Alexander, 320.
Ramusio, 55, 51, 235.
Rappahannock, the, 666, 667.
Ravier, 26.
Raymond, Henry J., 321.
Ré, Protestants in, 225.
Read, Nathan, 331.
Reading, 427.
Réal, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28, 32–35.
Recantations of the Early Lollards, The, by EDWARD P. CHEYNEY, 423.
Recent Economic Changes in Massachusetts (paper), 413.
Recollections of the Civil War, by Charles A. Dana, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 568.
Recopilaciones de Leyes, 49.
Red Book of the Exchequer, J. H. Round and Hubert Hall on the (Review), 387 760.
Reddaway, W. F., *The Monroe Doctrine*, by GEORGE F. TUCKER (Review), 180.
Redpath, James, 318.
Reemelin, Charles, 318, 319.
Reformation, the French, and the French People in the Sixteenth Century, by H. HAUSER, 217.
Reformation, the French, as a social movement, 220–227.
Reign of Terror, the, 306.
Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, The, by Morris Jastrow, by JOHN P. PETERS (Review), 502.
Reminiscences of an Indian Official, 262, 263.
RENICK, E. I., *History and Digest of the International Arbitrations to which the United States has been a Party*, by John B. Moore (Review), 563.
Reppingdon, Philip, 424, 427–429.
Repplier, Agnes, *Philadelphia, The Place and the People*, by HOWARD M. JENKINS (Review), 551.
Report on the Canadian Archives, 1897 by Douglas Brymner (Review), 394.
Report on the Records of the India Office, 249.
Representatives, House of, 81, 652, 655.
Republican clubs, 320.
Republican National Convention, The First, by GEORGE W. JULIAN, 313.
Republican party, the, 660.
République, Place de la, 5.
Resaca de la Palma, 5.
Réunion, the island of, 442, 448.
Reynolds, Gen., 671, 672.
Reynolds, Governor, 635.
Rhio, Dutch negotiations with, 252.
Rhode Island, 116, 117, 125, 126, 303, 317, 318, 320, 465; records of, 6, 10.
Rhodes, James, 13, 420.
RHODES, JAMES F., *The Battle of Gettysburg*, 665.
Robinson, Dr. Charles, 82, 83, 85, 97, 320.
Robinson, Sir Hercules, 264.
Robinson, James H., *Petrarch, the First Modern Scholar and Man of Letters*, by FERDINAND SCHWILL (Review), 514.
Rocca, Gen. della, *The Autobiography of a Veteran* (Review), 589.
Rochambeau, Count de, 420, 444.
Rodney, Admiral, 67.
Rogers, Robert, Mayor of Bristol, 685, 690–692, 696, 701.
Rogers, Thorold, 217.
Rohan, Princess de, 31.

Rolf the Ganger, 58.
Romance of the House of Savoy, The, by Alethea Wiel (Review), 388.
Romansch dialects, books in the, 16.
Rome, 473; Church of, attacked by Cromwell, 242.
Rome, Handbook to Christian and Ecclesiastical, by "H. M. and M. A. R. T." (Review), 191.
Romero, Matias, *Mexico and the United States*, by G. P. W. (Review), 580.
Root, Jesse, 284.
Rooper, Thomas, 120, 330.
Ropes, John C., 12.
Rosas, José Maria, 643, 649.
Ross, James, 118.
Rouen, 225; the Reformation at, 223.
Round, J. H., *The Red Book of the Exchequer* (Review), 387, 760.
Roussel, Gérard, 221.
Royal Historical Society, Transactions of, XII (Review), 759.
Roy, J. Edmond, *Histoire de la Seigneurie de Lauzon*, by GEORGE M. WRONG (Review), 578.
Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, reports of the, 413, 416.
Royal Geographical Society, the, 45, 46.
Royce, Alice C., editor of *Historic New York* (Review), 547.
Richard, J. W., 417, 418.
Richard II., of England, 433; commercial policy of, 231.
Richardson, Mr., 94.
Richepanse, 444.
Richmond, 666, 670.
Rigge, Robert, 423, 428.
Ringwalt, Ralph C., *Modern American Oratory* (Review), 392.
Rio Janeiro, 447.
Ripaud, 449.
Ripley, D., 318, 319.
Rise and Growth of American Politics, The, by Henry J. Ford, by JOHN W. PERRIN (Review), 592.
RIVES, G. L., *Spain and the United States in 1795*, 62; *The Spanish Revolution 1868–1875*, by Edward H. Strobel (Review), 362.
Rivington's *Gazette*, 16.
ROBINSON, J. H., *History of Modern Europe*, by Ferdinand Schwill (Review), 388.
Rusk, Senator (of Texas), 86, 87.
Russ, Horatio G., 317.
Russell, Captain Peter, Journal of, 1779, 1780, *The Siege of Charleston* (Document), 478.
Russell, Elizabeth, 478.
Russell, Memoirs of Lady, and Lady Herbert, edited by Lady Stepney, by THOMAS W. HIGGINSON (Review), 713.
Rutledge, John, 113.

Sabin, *Dictionary of American Bibliography*, 14.
Sackett, William A., 318.
St. Augustine, plan to capture, 244.
St. Catherine, the channel of, 56.
St. Christopher, church of, 426.
St. Clair County, 635.
St. Clair, Governor, 107, 628, 629, 631, 635.
St. Clement, the chapel of, Bristol, 679.
St. Domingo, 242, 243, 443–446.
St. Francis, the stigmata of, 637.
St. Frideswide's, cemetery of, 424.
St. Gall, the tower of, 9.
St. Helena, 37; reminiscences, 444.
St. Iago de Cuba, 243; expedition against, 324, 325; privateer from, 324.
St. Jean de Gardonnenque, 226.
St. John's Gate, 130, 131.
St. John's Island, 243.
St. Lawrence, the gulf of, 45.
St. Martin, Lawrence de, 434.
St. Martin de Valmeroux, heretics at, 226.
St. Maixent, heretics, at, 226.
St. Mary, church of, 431.
St. Paul, church of, 426, 431.
Saintonge, Protestants in, 225, 227.
Saladin and the Fall of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, by Stanley Lane-Poole, by J. R. JEWETT (Review), 707.
Salcedo, Nemesio, 644, 645.
Salem, 241.
Salem Neck, 55.
Salers, heretics at, 226.
Salisbury, the Bishop of, 434.
Salisbury, John, Earl of, 425.
Salmon, Professor, of Vassar, 19, 412.
Saltwood, prison at, 431.
San Domingo, 242, 243, 443–446.
Sandy Hook, 456.
San Ildefonso, the second treaty of, 446.
San Miguel el Grande, 649; the commissioner of, 638.
San Nicolas, university of, 636.

Santa Anna, 85.
Santiago and the Freeing of Spanish America, 1741 (Documents), 323.
Santiago de Cuba, 243, 324, 325.
Santiago de la Vega, 323, 325.
Saráwak, the government of, 246, 260–262, 267–272.
Saráwak River, 260.
Sault au Matelot, 131.
Savannah, 480–483.
Savary, 27, 29–34.
Savile, Sir George, Bart., First Marquis of Halifax, The Life and Letters of, by H. C. Foxcroft, by EDWARD PORRITT (Review), 519.
Savoy, The Romance of the House of, by Alethea Wiel (Review), 388.
Sawtre, William, 431.
Saxton, General, 100.
Schofield, General, 99.
Schomburgk, Mr., 470.
Schomburgk line, the, 471.
Schoolcraft, Henry R., 420.
Schott, Capt., 43.
Schouler, James, 13, 419.
Schwab, J. C., 413.
Schwill, Ferdinand, *History of Modern Europe*, by J. H. R. (Review), 388.
SCHWILL, FERDINAND, *Petrarch the First Modern Scholar and Man of Letters*, by James H. Robinson (Review), 514.
Scinde, 439.
Scindia, the, 440.
SCOTT, AUSTIN, *Holmes vs. Walton: The New Jersey Precedent*, 456.
Scott, Gen. Winfield, 85, 659.
Search for the Venezuela-Guiana Boundary, The, by GEORGE L. BURR, 470.
Secession, The, and Reconstruction of Tennessee, by James W. Fertig, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 187.
Second Annual Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission of the American Historical Association, by EDWARD G. BOURNE (Review), 738.
Sedgwick, Major Robert, 229, 230, 243, 244.
Sedgwick, Theodore, 328–330.
Seeley, Sir J. R., 228.
Ségur, Count de, 25, 420.
Selangor, 266.
Seminary Ridge, 671, 672, 675.
Senate, the, 652, 655, 659, 660; the functions of the, 308.
Seringapatam, 440.
Serry, works of, 637, 638.
Seven Months a Prisoner, by J. V. Hadley (Review), 198.
Seventeenth Century, The History of English Democratic Ideas in the, by G. P. Gooch, by FRANK STRONG (Review), 148.
Seven Years' War, the, 293, 439.
Seville, 47, 48.
Sewall, Samuel, diary of, 241.
Seynon, John, 431.
Shafter, in Cuba with, by John D. Miley, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 750.
Sharpless, Isaac, *A Quaker Experiment in Government*, by HOWARD M. JENKINS (Review), 165.
Shelby, Isaac, 654.
Shelley, Captain, 242.
Shenandoah Valley, the, 666.
Shepard, Thomas, to Hugh Peter, 1645 (Documents), 105.
Sherman, W. P., 317.
Short, chargé d'affaires at Madrid, 74.
Siam; trade with, 249, 256; King of, 262.
Sichel, Edith, *The Household of the Lafayettes*, by EDWARD E. HALE, JR. (Review), 197.
Sickles, Gen., 673, 674.
Siebert, Wilbur H., *The Underground Railroad from Slavery to Freedom*, by SAMUEL T. PICKARD (Review), 557.
Siege of Charleston, the; Journal of Captain Peter Russell, 1779, 1780 (Document), 478.
Sikh police, 268, 270.
Simcoe, Governor, 478.
Simkins, Arthur, 120, 330.
Singapore, island of, 252–260, 262, 267, 271.
Sir Robert Peel, from His Private Papers, edited by Charles S. Parker, by EDWARD PORRITT (Review), 722.
Skalpieren in Nordamerika, von Geo. Friederici, by JAMES MOONEY (Review), 197.
Skene, Governor, 283, 284.
Sloane, William M. 418.
SLOANE, W. M., *Napoleon's Plans for a Colonial System*, 439.
SMITH, GOLDWIN, *Pitt: Some Chapters of his Life and Times*, by Lord Ashbourne (Review), 527.

Smith, Gustavus, 328.
Smith, Isaac, 459, 461.
SMITH, MUNROE, *Bismarck, the Man and the Statesman*, by Prince von Bismarck (Review), 536; *Gedanken und Erinnerungen*, von Otto Fürst von Bismarck (Review), 536.
Smith, Theodore C., *The Liberty and Free Soil Parties in the Northwest* by GEORGE W. JULIAN (Review), 180.
Smith, William, 430.
Smith, William, *History of Canada* by, 129.
Sobremonte, the Marquis of, 449, 450.
Sociology, American Journal of, 27.
Somerset County, 457.
Smith, William,
Soncino, Raimondo di, 46.
"Sons of Liberty" in Conn., 279, 281.
Sonville, the Chabots of, 59.
Soranzo, 55.
Sotteville, heretics at, 225.
South Africa, High Commissioner for, 267.
South America, 231, 236, 242; an asylum for negroes, 101.
South America, The History of, from its Discovery to the Present Time, translated by Adnah H. Jones, by EDWARD G. BOURNE (Review), 756.
Southampton (L. I.), records of, 6.
South Carolina, 5, 111–128, 327, 328, 330, 331; arming negroes in, 100; an asylum for negroes, 101; legislature of, 128.
South Carolina in the Presidential Election of 1800 (Documents), 111.
Southern Confederacy, 662.
South Natick, Historical and Natural History Society of, 328.
Spain, 45, 47–51, 53, 56, 62–67, 69, 70, 73–78, 209, 426, 443, 445, 447, 449–454, 474, 609, 772; King of, 326, 327; policy of Cromwell toward, 228–245; rights of, in Venezuela, 471–473.
Spain and the United States in 1795, by G. L. RIVES, 62.
Spain, Our Navy in the War with, by John R. Spears, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 750.
Spain, The War with, by Charles Morris, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 750.
Spalding, R. P., 317.
Spanish America, 231, 233, 234, 236–238; proposed conquest of, 325–328.
Spanish America, Santiago and the Freeing of, 1741 (Documents), 223.
Spanish Bourbons, the, 447, 452.
Spanish colonies, the trade with the, 63.
Spanish Main, the, 243.
Spanish Revolution, The, 1868–1875, by Edward H. Strobel, by G. L. RIVES (Review), 362.
Sparling, Samuel E., *Municipal History and Present Organization of the City of Chicago* (Review), 577.
Spears, John R., *Our Navy in the War with Spain*, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 750.
Spice Islands, the, 50, 53; conquered by England, 251; restored to the Dutch, 252; trade with the, 247–249, 251, 252, 270.
Spiritual Franciscans, the, 428.
Spooner, Thomas, 318.
Spooner, Wyman, 320.
Spratt, D. H., 318.
SPRING, LEVERETT W., *The Career of a Kansas Politician*, 80; *The True History of the Missouri Compromise and its Repeal*, by Mrs. Archibald Dixon (Review), 560.
Stamp Act, the, papers relating to, 9; views of John Adams concerning the, 293, 296, 297; vote of Cambridge on the, 20.
Stamford, 430.
Stanton, Edwin M., 97, 98, 670.
Stanton, Edwin M., Life and Public Services of, by George C. Gorham, by FREDERIC BANCROFT (Review), 745.
Stanton, Frederic P., 90, 92.
Stanwood, Edward, *History of Presidential Elections*, by E. C. B. (Review), 391.
State Banking in Maryland, History of, by Alfred C. Bryan, by H. B. G. (Review), 762.
Staten Island, 456.
State Papers of Thurloe, 235.
States-General, the, 472, 474.
Statesman's Year-book, 247.
State *vs.* Parkhurst, 463.
Stephens, Alexander H., 661.
Stephens, H. Morse, 410, 413, 417.
STEPHENS, H. MORSE, *The Administrative History of British Dependencies in the Further East*, 246; *The Building of the British Empire*, by Alfred T. Story (Review), 712; *The great Lord Burghley*, by Martin A. S. Hume (Review), 709; *The Growth of Empire*, by Arthur W. Jose (Review), 712.

Stepney, Lady, editor of *Memoirs of Lady Russell and Lady Herbert*, by THOMAS W. HIGGINSON (Review), 713.

Stern, Alfred, *Geschichte Europas seit den Verträgen von* 1815 *bis zum Frankfurter Frieden von* 1871, II, by CHARLES M. ANDREWS (Review), 153.

Stevens, A. J., 318, 320.

Stevens, Thaddeus, 102.

Stone, A. P., 320.

Stone, J. W., 317.

Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War, by G. F. R. Henderson, by HY. KYD DOUGLAS (Review), 371.

Story, Alfred T., *The Building of the British Empire*, by H. MORSE STEPHENS (Review), 712.

Story, Richard, 433.

Stow's Chronicle, 61.

Straits Settlements, the, 253, 260, 261; government of, 246, 264–272.

Strasburg, 22, 23, 25.

Strobel, Edward H., *The Spanish Revolution*, 1868–1875, by G. L. RIVES (Review), 362.

Strong, Caleb, Letters to, 1786, 1800, (Documents), 328.

Strong, Frank, 419.

STRONG, FRANK, *The Causes of Cromwell's West Indian Expedition*, 228; *The History of English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century*, by G. P. Gooch (Review), 148.

Strong, Rev. S. C., 328.

Stryker, William S., *The Battles of Trenton and Princeton*, by HENRY C. CAMERON (Review), 731.

Stuart, Gen., 668, 671.

Stuart, Mr., 24.

Stuarts, the, 295.

Stury, Sir Richard, 426.

Suabia, 36.

Sudbury, Archbishop Simon of, 428.

Sullivan, Gen. John, 420.

Sulu, Sultan of, 269.

Sumatra, acquired by the Dutch, 253; factories in, 247, 248, 252, 253.

Sumner, W. G., note to the Editor, by, 347.

Sumter, Fort, 661.

Sungei Ujong, 266.

Supreme Court, the, 457, 459–463, 468.

Surat, trade with, 247.

Susquehanna, the, 567, 668.

Sweden, 40.

Swettenham, Sir Frank, 267.

Switzerland, 24, 445.

Swynderby, William, 427, 430, 438.

Symmes, John Cleves, 459, 461.

Talleyrand, 36, 76, 443, 448.

Taneytown (Md.), 671.

Taussig, F. W., 413.

Taylor, Hannis, *The Origin and Growth of the English Constitution*, II, by CHARLES L. WELLS (Review), 348.

Taylor, John, 307.

Tecumseh (Kan.), 80.

Temple, the prison of the, 21.

Temporary Acts and Laws of His Majesty's Province of New Hampshire (reprint), (Review), 591.

Tenasserim, 249.

TERRY, BENJAMIN, *Fustel de Coulanges*, by Paul Guiraud (Review), 389.

Tennessee, 127, 317; the constitution of, 652; political parties in, 652–664.

Tennessee Historical Society, 654.

Tennessee, The Secession and Reconstruction of, by James W. Fertig, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 187.

Texas, 317, 445, 447, 660; her relation to Mexico, 332.

Teypan, 649.

THAYER, WILLIAM R., *Cavour*, by Countess Evelyn Cesaresco (Review), 725.

Thibaud, 21.

Thiérache, 225.

Thiers, 443.

Thlyde, expedition of, 682.

Thomas, William B., 318.

Thorne, Robert, 48.

Thornton, Sir Edward, 4.

Thorpe, Francis N., *The Constitutional History of the American People*, by ANSON D. MORSE (Review), 734.

Thumery, Marquis de, 22.

Thurloe, letters to, 237.

Thurloe's *State Papers*, 235, 236.

Thwaites, Reuben G., 410.

Thwaites, R. G., editor of the *Collections of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin*, XIV (Review), 199.

Tigert, John J., *The Making of Methodism*, by CHARLES J. LITTLE (Review), 555.

Tilden, D. R., 317.

TILTON, W. F., *Drake and the Tudor Navy*, by Julian S. Corbett (Review), 516.

Tippoo Sahib, 440.
Tiverton, annual meeting at, 686, 687.
Todd, John, 625, 627–633.
Tompkins, Daniel D., Public Papers of, edited by Hugh Hastings (Review), 392.
Topeka, 101; the convention, 83, 84, 86.
Toronto, the Public Library of, 478; University of, 410.
Torrettes, the Chabots of, 59.
Torrez, Rodrigo de, 325.
Toulon, 71, 72.
Tout, T. F., *The Empire and the Papacy* (Review), 142.
Toryism in Conn., 276–281.
Township and Borough, by Frederic W. Maitland, by CHARLES GROSS (Review), 143.
Townships in Conn., government of, 275.
Transactions of the Royal Historical Society XII. (Review), 759.
Transylvanus, Maximilianus, 50.
Treaty of 1824 between England and Holland, 259.
Treaty of Versailles, the, 439.
Trelawny, Edward, 323.
Trenton, 457.
Trenton and Princeton, The Battles of, by William S. Stryker, by HENRY C. CAMERON (Review), 731.
Trevett *vs.* Weeden, 465.
Tribune, the, 316, 321.
Trinidad, 243.
Trinity College, Cambridge, 417.
Trivigiano, Angelo, 50.
Trottier, François, 628.
Trumbull, Governor, 281, 282, 284.
Trumbull, H. Clay, *War Memories of an Army Chaplain,* by E. BENJ. ANDREWS (Review), 748.
Trumbull, Joseph, 282.
Tryon, Gen., 291.
Tucker, George, 13.
TUCKER, GEORGE F., *The Monroe Doctrine,* by W. F. Reddaway (Review), 180.
Tufts College, history requirements of, 18.
Tuileries, the, 23, 26.
Tumangong, the, 267.
Turgot, criticisms of, on America, 306.
Turner, Frederick J., 411.

Ulysses S. Grant, his Life and Character, by Hamlin Garland, by FREDERICK W. MOORE (Review), 377.
Underground Railroad, The, from Slavery to Freedom, by Wilbur H. Siebert, by SAMUEL T. PICKARD (Review), 557.
Union Democrats, the, 661.
Union League, the Grand Council of the, 102, 103.
Union Lincoln Club, 102.
United States, the, 38, 236, 299, 301, 302, 306, 331, 443–447, 452; the constitution of the, 465–467; the historical periodicals in the, 17; the people of the, 1, 2; the President of the, 308; the Supreme Court of, 468; territory of the, 332.
United States, Address to the people of the, 321.
United States, International Arbitrations to which the, has been a Party, History and Digest of, by John B. Moore, by E. I. RENICK (Review), 563.
United States, Mexico and the, by Matias Romero, by G. P. W. (Review), 580.
United States, Spain and the, in 1795, by G. L. RIVES, 62.
United States Treasury Situation in 1893–1897 (paper), 413.
Upper Canada, 478.
Uruguay, 449.
Utrecht, the peace of, 448, 471, 474.
Uzès, the Cabots of, 59.

Valentin, Francisco Fernandez, 645.
Valentini, Ph. J J., deceased, 595.
Valladolid, 53, 636, 537, 642, 647–649.
Valcgnes, 58.
Van Buren, Martin, 87, 314, 317, 653, 655 657.
Van Rensselaer, Mrs. John K., *Goede Vrouw of Mana-ka-ta* (Review), 590.
Vassar College, 412.
Vaughn, John C., 317, 318.
Vedder, Henry C., *A History of the Baptists of the Middle States,* by WM. H. WHITSITT (Review), 553.
Venables, 232, 236, 243.
Venezuela, 243, 470, 471, 473, 476.
Venezuela-Guiana Boundary Commission, 418.
Venezuela-Guiana Boundary, The Search for the, by GEORGE L. BURR, 470.
Venice, 50, 52, 53, 55, 60.
Vera Cruz, 64.
Vergennes, the Count de, 65, 67, 300, 301.
Vermont, 315, 317, 318, 320; Republican committee of, 313.

Vernon, Admiral, 323–328, 420.

"Vernon-Wager Navy Papers," 323, 420.

Versailles, the Treaty of, 449.

Vestry Book and Register, The, of Bristol Parish, Virginia, edited by Churchill G. Chamberlayne (Review), 393.

Vexin, the, 225.

Vicksburg, the siege of, 665, 677.

Victor, captain-general of La., 445.

Vigo, Francis, 109.

Vincennes, France, 21, 26–28, 33–35.

Vincennes, Indiana, 108, 628, 631, 632.

Vincent, John M., 415.

Virginia, 68, 317, 318, 465, 654, 660, 665, 668, 671, 682; the colony of, 697; territorial claims of, 623–635.

Virginia Antiquities, Association for the Preservation of, 5.

Virginia Company, the, 683; records of, 420.

Virginia, the Army of Northern, 667.

"Virginia plan," the, 464, 465, 467.

Vitry, 226.

Volga, the, 441.

Voltaire, 649.

Von Holst, H., 14.

Voyages, The, of the Cabots; Latest Phases of the Controversy, by Samuel E. Dawson, by GEORGE P. WINSHIP (Review), 159.

Wabash, the, 623, 635.

Wade, Benjamin F., 102.

Wade, Senator, 103.

"Wakarusa War," 86.

Walker, C. S., 413.

Walker, Robert J., 90.

Walker, Capt. Samuel, 92.

Wallace, Alfred R., *The Wonderful Century, its Successes and its Failures* (Review), 389.

Wallingford, 288.

Walton, Elisha, 457, 459.

Walton, Holmes vs.: The New Jersey Precedent, by AUSTIN SCOTT, 456.

Ward, Dana, 330; Henry Dana, 120 John, 120, 330.

War, the Department of, 7.

War of 1812, the, 447.

War Memories of an Army Chaplain, by H. Clay Trumbull, by E. BENJ. ANDREWS (Review), 748.

War with Spain, The, by Charles Morris, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 750.

Warren, Capt., 324.

Warren, Gen., 673.

Washington, city of, 86, 91, 96, 99, 101, 111, 116, 119, 121, 123, 126, 127, 330, 420, 444, 470, 656, 665, 668, 669, 671, 673; convention at, in 1856, 316; the Departments at, 7.

Washington, George, 71–73, 287, 299, 308, 310, 311, 330, 460, 468; foreign policy of, 2; the papers of, 8; letters of, 420; Farewell Address, 302.

Washington, Letters to, and Accompanying Papers, edited by Stanislaus M. Hamilton, by WORTHINGTON C. FORD (Review), 729.

Washington, William, 120.

Watertown, 287.

Watson, *Story of France* (Review), 586.

Wauters, Alphonse, deceased, 200.

Wayne, the victory of, 107.

Weare, G. E., *Cabot's Discovery of North America,* by GEORGE P. WINSHIP (Review), 159.

WEATHERLY, ULYSSES G., *La Formation de la Prusse Contemporaine,* par Godefroy Cavaignac (Review), 149.

Webster, Daniel, 4, 311, 659.

Weiss, M. N., 222, 226.

Weld, Sir Frederick, 266.

Wellesley, Arthur, 440.

Wellesley, the Province of, 250.

Wellesley College, 18.

WELLS, CHARLES L., *The Origin and Growth of the English Constitution,* by Hannis Taylor (Review), 348.

Wentworth, Gen., 323, 325.

Western Civilization, An Essay on, in its Economic Aspects, by W. Cunningham, by B. PERRIN (Review), 135.

Western Department, Commissioners for the, 633.

Western Pacific, High Commissioner for the, 267.

Western Reserve University, 419.

West Florida, 447.

West Hartford, 283.

West Indian Expedition, The Causes of Cromwell's, by FRANK STRONG, 228.

West Indies, the, 38, 49, 50, 66, 67, 325; in relation to Cromwell, 228–245.

West Indies, The, by Amos K. Fiske, by E. G. B. (Review), 763.

West Jersey, 459.

Weston, George M., 318.

Weymouth, Capt. George, 683.

Whampoa, 261.

WHEELER, J. R., *The Homeric Palace*, by Norman M. Isham (Review), 758.

Whig party, the, 313–315, 653, 654, 656–663.

White Bay, 44.

White House, the, 97.

White, Hugh Lawson, 653, 655–658.

Whitelocke, 451.

Whitney, John, The Ancestry of, by Henry Melville, by MELVILLE M. BIGELOW (Review), 193.

WHITSITT, WM. H., *A History of the Baptists of the Middle States*, by Henry C. Vedder, 553.

Whitson, John, 692, 694.

Whittemore, Samuel, monument of, 4.

Wiel, Alethea, *The Romance of the House of Savoy* (Review), 388.

Willcocks, William, 457, 460.

Williamsburg (Va.), the old church at, 3.

Williams, Frederick W., 410; John, 653; Roger, 236, 239–242; Talcott, 42.

Williamson, George C., *Portrait Miniatures* (Review), 196.

Willoughby, Lord, 236.

Wilmot, David, 320, 321.

Wilmot Proviso, the, 317, 321.

Wilson, James, 464.

Wilson, Woodrow, 658.

Winchester, 666, 673.

Winchester, the Bishop of, 428.

WINSHIP, GEORGE P., *Cabot's Discovery of North America*, by G. E. Weare (Review), 159; *John and Sebastian Cabot; The Discovery of North America*, by C. Raymond Beazley (Review), 159; *Mexico and the United States*, by Matias Romero (Review), 580; *The Voyages of the Cabots*, by Samuel E. Dawson (Review), 159.

Winsor, Justin, 470; *Narrative and Critical History* of, 13, 15.

Winston, Richard, 628, 633.

Winter, T. D., 331, 340–342.

Winthrop, John, Jr., 240.

Winyaw (S. C.), 126, 127.

Wisconsin, 317, 318, 320; Republican Committee of, 313; State Historical Society of, 15, 410.

Wisconsin, Collections of the State Historical Society of, XIV, edited by R. G. Thwaites (Review), 199.

Wisconsin History, Leading Events of, by Henry E. Legler, by JAMES D. BUTLER (Review), 381.

With Sampson through the War, by A. M. Goode, by THEODORE A. DODGE (Review), 750.

Wolcott, Roger, 310.

Wolfenbüttel mappemonde, the, 48.

Wolsey, Cardinal, 55, 57.

Wonderful Century, The, its Successes and its Failures, by Alfred R. Wallace (Review), 389.

WOODBURN, JAMES A., *Autobiography and Political Correspondence of Augustus Henry, Third Duke of Grafton*, edited by Sir Wm. Anson (Review), 716.

Woodburn, James A., editor of *The American Revolution* (Review), 761.

Wood, John, 118.

Wood, S. N., 318, 320.

Worcester, 293; records of, 6.

Worcester, William (Botoner), 682.

Wray, G. C., 265.

Writings of James Monroe, The, I., II., edited by Stanislaus M. Hamilton (Reviews), 740.

Writs of Assistance, 292.

Wrong, George M., 410.

WRONG, GEORGE M., *Histoire de la Seigneurie de Lauzon* (Review), 578.

Wycliffe, John, 423–425, 427–432.

Wylie, James H., *History of England under Henry the Fourth*, by EDWARD P. CHEYNEY (Review), 145.

Ximenes, Grand Master of Malta, 449.

Yale Law School, 419.

Yale Review, the, 17.

Yale University, 410, 413, 419–421.

York (Pa.), 667.

York (Toronto), 478.

York, Society of Merchant Adventurers of, 682.

Yucatan, 243.

Zeeland Chamber, papers of the, 474.

Zeno, the Brothers Nicolo and Antonio, The Annals of the Voyages of, by Fred. W. Lucas, by B. F. DE COSTA (Review), 726.

Zwingli and the Baptist party in Zurich (paper), 418.